THE

Churchman's Magazine.

VOL. V.] NOVEMBER & DECEMBER, 1808. [No. 8.

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoir of the late Right Reverend RICHARD HURD, D. D. *Lord Bishop of Worcester.*

[From the European Magazine for June, 1808.]

BISHOP Hurd was the second son of John Hurd, a respectable yeoman at Congreve, in the parish of Penkridge, Staffordshire. He received at a country school of no fame the rudiments of an education which was completed at Emanuel college, in Cambridge, where he was placed at a very early time of life, and of which he became in due time a fellow. From this situation he was removed to a benefice of small value, the secluded parish of Thureaston, in Leicestershire, and imbibed there a love of rural retirement, which he avowed in very feeling terms in his dedication of the *Arte Poetica* of Horace to Bishop Warburton. His first steps towards eminence were marked out for him by that prelate, whose ardent passions seldom failed to procure a due reward to those merits which his acute and busy observation never overlooked. It is said, that Mr. Hurd was introduced to him by Ralph Allen, Esq. of Prior Park, near Bath, whose friendship for Dr. Warburton is well known; and that he had attracted the notice and the favour of Mr. Allen by his singularly elegant dialogues on chivalry and romance. Be this as it may, certain it is, that Warburton advanced him to the archdeaconry of Gloucester, and soon after procured his appointment of preacher at Lincoln's-inn-chapel, upon the vacancy occasioned by his own resignation.

The twelve discourses which he delivered at the lecture which had been founded by his patron for the illustration of the prophecies, added to the high literary reputation which he already enjoyed, that of a pious, acute, and learned divine; nor

was the elegance and purity of style which distinguished those sermons inferior to the deep research and strength of argument which they exhibited. He owed to them all his future advancement. They attracted the attention of that last survivor of the Augustan age in Britain, William, Earl of Mansfield; and at the request of that nobleman, Dr. Hurd was appointed to succeed the late Archbishop of York as preceptor to their royal highnesses the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York; and very soon after, in 1774, his Majesty, with circumstances of grace and regard which peculiarly marked his perfect approbation, conferred on him the bishoprick of Lichfield and Coventry. In 1781, the king appointed him clerk of the closet. In the same year he was translated to the see of Worcester; and in 1783, on the death of Archbishop Cornwallis, he had the honour of receiving the offer of the primacy, and the still higher honour of declining it.

The remainder of his life was passed, with very few intervals of absence, in his diocese, where he enjoyed an almost filial affection and respect from all around him. His serious employments consisted in the strictest discharge of the spiritual and temporal duties of his station; and his amusements, in literary composition, and the revisal of his former works. The see of Worcester is obliged to him for many benefits which he has left to his successors, and in particular for a library in Hartlebury Castle, which he has dedicated to their use. If this library includes his own private collection, it must be indeed an inestimable treasure, for he possessed, by purchase, the books of Bishop Warburton, which included those of Pope.

He died unmarried, at Hartlebury, on Saturday, the 6th of June, in the present year, in the eighty-ninth year of his age.

Of his familiar and domestic story we know little: for, as has been already observed, he outlived, generally speaking, those who might have furnished us with such intelligence. In the manuscript diary of a late literary friend, the following memorandum occurs: "Dined in company with Bishop Hurd, and Ross, Bishop of Exeter, at Mr. Burrell's, in Harley-street, the 7th of February, 1784—Hurd is a man of pleasing appearance, good countenance, and genteel address, but of very few words; at least he said but little that day." His literary history is, in fact, the history of his life; and we shall look for-

ward with an anxious hope to an impartial and justly critical publication of it. The limits of this work, both as to time and space, while they confine us almost to a mere catalogue of his works, may save us from the imputed arrogance of disquisitions to which we are, perhaps, unequal.

His first publication was Horace's Epistle to the *Pisos*, in 1749, which was reprinted, together with the epistle *ad Augustum*, in 1753, in two octavo volumes, with an English commentary and notes. This work, various editions of which have since appeared, in three small volumes, in octavo, is esteemed one of the most acute and classical pieces of criticism ever produced by an English writer. Of his Letters on Chivalry and Romance, and of their fortunate effect, I have already spoken; they were re-published in 1765, together with his Moral and Political Dialogues, in three small volumes, each of them having before appeared anonymously. About the same time, Mr. Hume put forth his Essay on the Nature and History of Religion, which, while it surprised the indifferent, offended the pious. Dr. Hurd answered it with a boldness and perspicuity which suited his calling and his talents, and drew on himself a bitter invective from Hume, who, in his rejoinder, charges him with "all the illiberal petulance, arrogance, and scurrility of the Warburtonian school."

The twelve Discourses at Bishop Warburton's Lectures for Lincoln's-inn-chapel, have been mentioned before: they were published in 1772. Some passages in them attacked by a Mr. Evanson, who had been a clergyman of the established Church, and was then labouring to justify his secession from it, by a sort of nibbling criticism on the theological works of eminent orthodox writers: to this person, we believe, Dr. Hurd returned no answer. He was then employed in a work which, though of a different cast from the generality of his literary occupations, was not less suited to the character of his talents, "Select Works of Abraham Cowley," with a preface and notes, which appeared also in 1772, in two small octavo volumes. In 1776, he published a volume of Sermons printed at Lincoln's-inn-chapel, between the years 1765 and 1776; to which, in 1781, he added two more. It is needless to dwell on the praise of Bishop Hurd's pulpit discourses, as their elegance and their energy have long combined to render them deservedly popular.

His largest work appeared in 1788: this was an edition of the works of Bishop Warburton, in seven volumes, in quarto, with a supplemental volume, in octavo; to the purchasers of which he then promised to deliver, at a future time, some account of the life and writings of that remarkable person: that promise, however, was never performed. He printed, in 1794, a discourse to that purpose, in a quarto pamphlet, by way of preface to the splendid book of which we are speaking; but it was never sold; and the suppression of it was made the subject of many paltry reflections, no sooner published than forgotten by all but the authors of them. The recollection, however, of those pointless shafts leads us to mention the only ground on which this prelate, not less distinguished by his talents than by the sweetness of his character, ever sustained an attack with any colour of justice. While he idolized the profound abilities of Warburton with all the enthusiasm of congenial acuteness and erudition, he loved him with all the force and vehement ardour of pure gratitude. Warburton's passions knew no medium; he either loved or hated; and in hatred, at least, the world will always be even with us. He left many bitter enemies; Bishop Hurd undertook the arduous task of defending his memory against them, and involved himself in the posthumous persecution. In this spirit he published, in the early part of his life, a pamphlet, entitled, "An Essay on the Delicacy of Friendship," intended to arraign the conduct of Dr. Jortin, who had ventured to utter some sort of censure on his patron; and this pamphlet the Bishop, in his cooler moments, took great pains to re-collect and destroy.

RELIGIOUS MEDITATIONS.

[Continued from page 366.]

No. VII.

THE MISERY OF SIN.

Prov. i. 7. iii. 13.—*The* FEAR OF THE LORD *is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction. Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding. For the merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold. She is more precious than rubies: and all the things thou canst desire, are not to be compared unto her. Length of days is in her right hand; and in her left hand riches and honour. Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace.*

MEDITATION.

WHILE the ways of that TRUE WISDOM, which consisteth in *the fear of the Lord*, are ways of pleasantness and peace, the opposite paths of ungodliness are paths of *misery*. For, what doth the prophet Isaiah declare?—'The wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest; whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my GOD, for the wicked.' —If I inquire only into the natural consequences of conduct, I may ask, How can the conduct of the wicked man be adapted to produce happiness to himself?—Does it render his family happy? No! Does it make him happy in himself, or in the possession of valuable friends? No!—But, if it does not benefit him during life, how will it stand him in stead, at the hour of death? View him on one side, while his conscience presents *the King of Terrors* on the other. Inquire whether he would counsel me to choose the path of vice as *the road to happiness:* or rather let me ask myself, whether the possession of the whole world would bribe me, to place myself in his situation.—What shall a man take in exchange for his soul? O let me then hear the voice of my SAVIOUR, who still waiteth to be gracious. MAY I ACQUAINT MYSELF WITH HIM, AND BE AT

PEACE. SO SHALL I DIE THE DEATH OF THE RIGHTEOUS, AND MY LAST END BE LIKE HIS.*

No. VIII.

THE NOBLEMAN'S SON CURED.

St. John iv. 46.—*So* JESUS *came again into Cana of Galilee, where he made the water wine. And there was a certain nobleman, whose son was sick at Capernaum. When he heard that* JESUS *was come out of Judea into Galilee, he went unto him, and besought him that he would come down, and heal his son; for he was at the point of death. Then said* JESUS *unto him, 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.' The nobleman saith unto him, 'Sir, come down, ere my child die.'*—JESUS *saith unto him, 'Go thy way; thy son liveth.' And the man believed the word that* JESUS *had spoken unto him, and he went his way. And as he was now going down, his servants met him, and told him, saying, 'Thy son liveth.' Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, 'Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him.' So the father knew that it was at the same hour in the which* JESUS *said unto him,* Thy son liveth: *and himself believed, and his whole house.*

MEDITATION.

OUR LORD, while he was at a distance from the patient, wrought and perfected this cure; and he hath still the same divine power, and he exerts it daily for our benefit in saving repentant sinners, and graciously restoring health to their souls. Oh! that bodily absence may not abate my faith, while praying for others or for myself; but that I may attain that blessedness, which our LORD hath promised to those, who have not seen and yet have believed.†—The cure, wrought on the nobleman's son, was the cause of producing *faith* in the hearts of all his house. BLESSED JESUS! thy power and mercy was not less employed in the latter, than in the former. Oh! may that power work in such a manner on my soul, as that I may be disposed cordially to receive thee; and that I, my wife, my children, and all con-

* Job xxii. 21. Numbers xxiii. 10. † St. John xx. 29.

nected with me, may possess such a disposition of mind; that, gratefully accepting the revelation which thou hast given us, we may faithfully improve it by a holy life; and, at the termination of this short and fleeting state of trial, we may be received into everlasting happiness, through the merits and mediation of thee, our SAVIOUR and REDEEMER. Amen.

No. IX.

THE FEAR OF GOD.

St. Mat. x. 28.—*Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear* HIM *which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your* FATHER. *But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my* FATHER, *which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my* FATHER, *which is in heaven. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of* cold water only, *in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you,* he shall in no wise lose his reward.

MEDITATION.

OH may I ever bear in mind, that the ETERNAL AND ALMIGHTY GOD should be the unceasing object of my love, and of my fear and reverence; and that, in comparison with the dread of his displeasure, there is nothing else which I should fear. All the terrors of the world will be disarmed by this consideration. In whatever situation of life I may be placed, let this engage me to be faithful to my divine Master; so shall I be truly faithful to myself, and to my fellow creatures.—MAY this discourse of OUR BLESSED LORD animate me to every *work of faith*, and to every *labour of love:* and, though poor, let me not be discouraged from any charitable endeavour for the good of others; since my heavenly Master, in his mercy, will remember even a cup of cold water, given to the least of his servants, under that character. With this encouragement, and with the variety of rewards destined to the various degrees of zeal and liberality, may I indulge a praiseworthy

PEACE. SO SHALL I DIE THE DEATH OF THE RIGHTEOUS, AND MY LAST END BE LIKE HIS.*

No. VIII.

THE NOBLEMAN'S SON CURED.

St. John iv. 46.—*So* JESUS *came again into Cana of Galilee, where he made the water wine. And there was a certain nobleman, whose son was sick at Capernaum. When he heard that* JESUS *was come out of Judea into Galilee, he went unto him, and besought him that he would come down, and heal his son; for he was at the point of death. Then said* JESUS *unto him, 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.' The nobleman saith unto him, 'Sir, come down, ere my child die.'*—JESUS *saith unto him, 'Go thy way; thy son liveth.' And the man believed the word that* JESUS *had spoken unto him, and he went his way. And as he was now going down, his servants met him, and told him, saying, 'Thy son liveth.' Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, 'Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him.' So the father knew that it was at the same hour in the which* JESUS *said unto him,* Thy son liveth: *and himself believed, and his whole house.*

MEDITATION.

OUR LORD, while he was at a distance from the patient, wrought and perfected this cure; and he hath still the same divine power, and he exerts it daily for our benefit in saving repentant sinners, and graciously restoring health to their souls. Oh! that bodily absence may not abate my faith, while praying for others or for myself; but that I may attain that blessedness, which our LORD hath promised to those, who have not seen and yet have believed.†—The cure, wrought on the nobleman's son, was the cause of producing *faith* in the hearts of all his house. BLESSED JESUS! thy power and mercy was not less employed in the latter, than in the former. Oh! may that power work in such a manner on my soul, as that I may be disposed cordially to receive thee; and that I, my wife, my children, and all con-

* Job xxii. 21. Numbers xxiii. 10. † St. John xx. 29.

nected with me, may possess such a disposition of mind; that, gratefully accepting the revelation which thou hast given us, we may faithfully improve it by a holy life; and, at the termination of this short and fleeting state of trial, we may be received into everlasting happiness, through the merits and mediation of thee, our SAVIOUR and REDEEMER. Amen.

No. IX.

THE FEAR OF GOD.

St. Mat. x. 28.—*Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear* HIM *which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your* FATHER. *But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my* FATHER, *which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my* FATHER, *which is in heaven. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of* cold water only, *in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you,* he shall in no wise lose his reward.

MEDITATION.

OH may I ever bear in mind, that the ETERNAL AND ALMIGHTY GOD should be the unceasing object of my love, and of my fear and reverence; and that, in comparison with the dread of his displeasure, there is nothing else which I should fear. All the terrors of the world will be disarmed by this consideration. In whatever situation of life I may be placed, let this engage me to be faithful to my divine Master; so shall I be truly faithful to myself, and to my fellow creatures.—MAY this discourse of OUR BLESSED LORD animate me to every *work of faith*, and to every *labour of love:* and, though poor, let me not be discouraged from any charitable endeavour for the good of others; since my heavenly Master, in his mercy, will remember even a cup of cold water, given to the least of his servants, under that character. With this encouragement, and with the variety of rewards destined to the various degrees of zeal and liberality, may I indulge a praiseworthy

disposition to abound in the work of the LORD; so that I may shine with distinguished glory in the day of retribution, and have an abundant entrance into his blessed kingdom.

No. X.

THE LORD'S DAY.

Exod. xx. 8.—*Remember* THE SABBATH DAY, *to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the* LORD THY GOD; *in it thou shalt not do any work; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the* LORD *made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore* THE LORD BLESSED THE SEVENTH DAY, AND HALLOWED IT.

MEDITATION.

I OBSERVE the solemn manner in which this commandment begins. REMEMBER—*preserve in thy memory—the Sabbath day to keep it holy:* from which I learn that the devoting of a *seventh day* to the service of GOD, and to the *holy use of man*, was, by divine command, handed down through the patriarchs from our first parents, and had in remembrance from the time that 'GOD blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.'* It is a day of *rest and comfort* to man and beast: it is a day of *religious improvement* to the human race. When I rise in the morning on Sunday, let me endeavour to withdraw my thoughts from the things of this transitory life; and to direct them to the hopes and happiness, which GOD has been pleased to promise to all who love him. Let me gratefully acknowledge the blessing of a day of rest, and show my respect for that day, by making myself as *clean* and *decent* in my appearance, as my circumstances will permit. Let me then attend my duty at Church, and take with me all my family; or at least all who are not prevented by some duty which obliges them to stay away. Our blessed SAVIOUR hath said to us, '*Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst*

* Genesis ii. v. 3. † Mat. xviii. v. 20.

*of them.'** He hath moreover given us his example; for he not only prayed most earnestly in private, but on the SABBATH he constantly attended the Synagogue, the Jewish place of divine worship.—Let me, therefore, never neglect to use my excellent privilege of worshipping in the House of the LORD. Let me cry out with David, 'My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the Courts of the LORD.'—Thus freed from the cares and labours of the week, I may employ some of the leisure of this sacred day, in attending to the moral and religious improvement, not only of myself, but of my wife and children; and I may thus promote both their happiness and my own. I may visit my sick neighbour or friend in his affliction: I may tell him of the mercy and loving kindness of GOD, and speak comfort to his soul. After a day so employed, my evening song shall be *a song of thanksgiving;* and I will retire to rest, in peace with all the world, and with my HEAVENLY FATHER; in hopes to rise refreshed the next morning, and to be ready to do my duty in that state to which it hath pleased GOD to call me.

No. XI.

THE WIDOW'S SON.

St. Luke vii. 11.—*And it came to pass, the day after, that* JESUS *went into a city called Nain; and many of his disciples went with him, and much people. Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow:—and much people of the city was with her. And when the* LORD *saw her, he had compassion on her, and said unto her, 'Weep not.' And he came and touched the bier: and they that bare him stood still. And he said, 'Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.' And he that was dead, sat up, and began to speak. And he delivered him to his mother. And there came a fear on all: and they glorified* GOD, *saying, 'that a great prophet is risen up among us; and, that* GOD *hath visited his people.'*

* Mat. xviii. 20.

MEDITATION.

MAY I always glorify GOD for this GREAT PROPHET, whom he raised up, not only for his people Israel, but for the salvation of the ends of the earth.* While the weeping parent was following her only son to the grave, there to deposit all the hopes of her widowed state, his mercy intervened, called back her lamented child from the dead, and turned her sorrow into a flood of joy. So will he who hath the keys of death and of the unseen world, awaken at length those who die in the LORD. So will he restore them to their desiring friends, to part no more. Oh! may I, in deep humility, strive to imitate the beneficence of my REDEEMER; and may my life, in my limited sphere, follow his blessed example, in doing all the good in my power! Though I cannot raise the dead, or exercise any miraculous power, yet I can visit the fatherless and widow in their affliction; I can console my sick and distressed neighbour, I can comfort him by kindness under his sufferings, and I can in many ways contribute to his recovering his health and strength; so that he may again be able to maintain himself and his family by his honest industry. If I can do nothing else, I can give him my prayers; and I may, by advice and example, induce and persuade him humbly to address his supplications to God, through the effectual mediation of a REDEEMER, who came to save that which was lost. I may thus do him greater charity than it is in the power of riches to bestow. ONE IMMORTAL SOUL is of far more value than the wealth of worlds.

No. XII.

THE CONFIRMATION OF YOUNG PERSONS.

Acts viii. 12.—*But when they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of* GOD, *and the name of* JESUS CHRIST, *they were baptized, both men and women. Then Simon himself believed also: and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done. Now, when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received*

* Acts xiii. 47.

the word of GOD, *they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the* HOLY GHOST: *for as yet* HE *was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the* LORD JESUS. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the HOLY GHOST.

MEDITATION.

WHEN young persons who have been baptized come to be confirmed in their faith, publicly, in the presence of GOD, and of the Church, it is an awful solemnity, and requires great and serious attention. The persons, so confirmed, do there devoutly profess their belief in the Gospel of CHRIST, and declare their resolution, *by the Grace of God*, to live in all holy obedience to his Commandments. In the time of the Apostles (as I read in Holy Scripture) the *laying on of Hands* on those who were baptized, was attended with an immediate and miraculous gift of the HOLY GHOST.—Though the visible and immediate operation of that power ceased with the first propagators of Christianity, yet the ordinance has been preserved in all ages of Christianity; and no doubt can be entertained, but that this rite, followed by obedience to GOD's Commandments, will be the means of obtaining the gift of the HOLY SPIRIT;—but this must be by *repentance* and by *renunciation of sin;* by *faith* in GOD, and *in his revealed word;* and by a *steadfast and effectual purpose of obedience.*—*Perfect* obedience we cannot hope to obtain; but if my children, when they are confirmed, are resolved 'to serve the LORD, if they delight in the Law of GOD, after the inner man, and endeavour to preserve a conscience void of offence towards GOD and towards man,'—I will offer up my prayers to GOD for them, in humble hope that their desires after the knowledge of GOD and his service may be strengthened, and that they may feel a more sensible alliance with the Church of GOD; *so* shall their *fruit* be unto holiness, and their *reward* and *recompence* be life everlasting.

No. XIII.

OUR DUTY TO GOD.

Micah vi. 6.—*Wherewith shall I come before the* LORD, *and bow myself before the* HIGH GOD? *Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the* LORD *be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgressions, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?* HE HATH SHOWED THEE, O MAN, WHAT IS GOOD;—*and what doth the* LORD *require of thee, but to* do justly, *and to* love mercy, *and to* walk humbly *with thy* GOD?

MEDITATION.

How simple, yet how comprehensive, are the principles of true Religion! *Justice* and *mercy* to my fellow creatures, and *humility* and *piety* to my GOD. What can be more plain or simple than this, or yet what is more comprehensive? For if I am JUST to my neighbour, I will not lie to him or deceive him by falsehood; I will not injure him or his property; I will not withhold from him that which is his due, or defraud him of what he is entitled to; but in all things act by him as I would wish him to act by me.—Again, if I love MERCY, I shall be filled with *good will* towards men;—that blessing which angels came from Heaven to announce: for mercy implies affection, benevolence, kindness, tenderness, meekness, patience, forgiveness. Let me cultivate these Christian virtues: so shall I in every fellow creature behold a brother—whom GOD, my CREATOR, made;—for whom CHRIST, my REDEEMER, died.—If I possess Christian *piety* and *humility*, I shall look up to the Cross of CHRIST, and to that alone: I shall disclaim all presumption, all self-righteousness, all dependence on my own strength, to will or perform. As a sinner, I will implore pardon and mercy through CHRIST; and through him look to the HOLY SPIRIT, for power to resist temptation, for power to form good resolutions, and for power to carry them into effect. So may I attain that *pure and undefiled religion* before GOD AND THE FATHER, which is this—to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep myself unspotted from the world.*

* St. James i. 27.

No. XIV.

THE PIOUS CENTURION.

St. Luke vii. 2.—*And a certain Centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick, and ready to die. And when he heard of* JESUS, *he sent unto him the elders of the Jews, beseeching him that he would come and heal his servant. And when they came to* JESUS, *they besought him instantly, saying,* '*That he was worthy for whom he should do this. For he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue.*' *Then* JESUS *went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the Centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him,* 'LORD, *trouble not thyself; for* I am not worthy *that thou shouldest enter under my roof. Wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers; and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.*' *When* JESUS *heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned him about, and said unto the people that followed him,* '*I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.*' *And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole that had been sick.*

MEDITATION.

LET me learn from this example, that there is no situation of life, no occupation, no profession, which prevents us from doing our duty *as pious Christians*, or exempts us from the obligation to it. The Centurion was a military man, placed in the way of temptation, and subject to the effects of bad example. Yet he was a model of piety and goodness.—May I endeavour to imitate his virtues!—his *kindness* to the person under his care and protection;—his *piety*, in giving assistance to the religious duties of the place where he was stationed;—and his *humility*, in the manner in which he solicited JESUS to heal his servant! 'LORD! trouble not thyself; for I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof; but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed.'—But, chiefly, O Lord! and earnestly do I pray, that I may imitate him in FAITH;—since, having re-

ceived evidence of the unblemished life, the heavenly doctrines, and the astonishing miracles of CHRIST, he had no distrust in his power, but believed him able to perform a miracle, at any distance:—So may CHRIST bless me! and may he grant me those things which I ask in faith, nothing doubting; *and as I have believed, so may it be done unto me!*

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

(From a Correspondent.)

A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.

[Continued from page 344.]

1. *Of Predestination.*

THERE is no need to say much, in statement of the hinge on which the controversy turns, in relation to this first point of it. The disputants consent in the acknowledging of a predestinating of some to life; while all others are passed over, say some Calvinists; but, say other Calvinists, the reprobation of those not ordained to life is also directly an object of the decree. The difference between both these descriptions of Calvinists and the Arminians consists in this, that the latter found the decree of God in favour of the elect, on his foreknowledge of their faith and obedience; while the former make it independent on that circumstance. There does not appear any thing immediately applicable, until we reach the 28th and 29th verses of the 8th chapter, in which we read as follows: "For whom he did foreknow, them also he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren: And whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

Nothing will be here said concerning the meaning of the word "called," because it will come more properly in another

place. When we take up the words "foreknown" and "predestinate," they seem to give a great advantage to the Arminians, in relation to the distinction on which their whole doctrine of predestination rests. And indeed, if the Apostle could be properly considered as speaking principally of individual character and principally in relation to another life; the authority would seem decisive.* But according to the principle of interpretation here supported, nothing was further from his thoughts. The spirit of the sentiment seems to be, that, in contrariety to the opinion of there being no admission to a state of covenant with God, except agreeably to the institutions of the law; he had, before the giving of the law, declared his purpose of extending the covenant to the Gentiles; as had been shown in a preceding part of the Epistle: that accordingly, there was a foreknowledge and a predestination of gentile converts; disengaged from rituals; which had not been ordained, until after the declaration of the said purpose and decree; that not only so, there had been a call given by the ministry of the word; and a compliance with the call, on the part of the then gentile professors; and that, in addition still—for the Apostle should be considered as now going on from the matter in dispute, to an undisputed fact—they who were called had been justified, or authoritatively declared righteous in the sight of God; and glorified by a portion of the Spirit of Glory's resting

* Two grounds are taken in order to avoid the effect, of there being given the first place to foreknowledge and the second to predestination, in an enumeration of the divine acts according to the intended order. It is remarked, first, that the expression is simply "when he did foreknow," without any mention of their faith and their obedience; and secondly, that the Greek word "προεγνω" often signifies foreknowing with affection; which is proved by other passages of scripture. Still, on the plan of interpretation adopted in common by the parties, the context seems to give the advantage greatly to the Arminians. For who are the persons spoken of? The answer is, from verse 28—"They who love God and for whose good all things work together." These are they whom God foreknew—whom he foreknew [may the Arminians say] with an affection which occasioned a predestination of them to eternal life, founded on the character of them which had gone before. The passage, here noticed, has been called by Calvinists a golden chain; the links of which are so connected, that he who has hold of one is secure of all; and he who is loose from one is equally so from the rest. Under this view of the passage, it would seem, that the station of foreknowledge in the chain is favourable to the Arminian scheme. Still, this is said under the persuasion, that there is no reference in the place to the salvation of individuals, either predestinated or foreknown.

on them; these two particulars having been demonstrated, by the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost.

The difference between justification and glorification, as demonstrated each of them by miracle, seems to be, that the former relates to the acceptance of persons; and the latter, to the qualifying of some of them to work miracles themselves. Such use of the word makes the passages analogous to many other places of scripture; one of which, is where it is said (2 Cor. iii. 8)—" How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?"—The Apostle could not have intended the glory hereafter, because he spoke of the past; and it is difficult to devise any meaning besides that here ascribed to the expression.

The reference supposed gives evident pertinency to the inference, that the Gentiles, as such, were owned to be a people admissible to the covenant: And the passage, placed in this point of view, is analogous to St. Peter's use of the same argument, in the 8th verse of the 15th chapter of the Acts; where he says—" God, who knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us." And what he understood by giving them the Holy Ghost, is evident in the transaction with Cornelius, recorded in the 10th chapter of the same book.

It must be acknowledged, that we have no such formal record of the pouring out of the " χαρισματα" or miraculous gifts on the Roman Church, as in the case of certain disciples at Ephesus, or as in that here referred to, of Cornelius and his assembled friends. But the same may be said concerning the churches of Galatia: And yet St. Paul manifestly refers to such an effusion on them, where he says, [chap. iii. 5] " he that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you; doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" That there had been, at the early period when the Apostle wrote to the converts in the capital of the empire, the same grace bestowed on them; is not only in itself highly probable, but seems referred to in several places of the Epistle. The first worthy of notice, is in the 5th verse of the 5th chapter; where it is said—" the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." The original word " εκκεχυται" being expressive, elsewhere, of the

pouring out of the "Χαρισματα" or extraordinary gifts; it is a circumstance, which favours the opinion of a reference to the subject here. The Apostle, indeed, denotes a manifestation to the hearts of the believers; and the having of a view to this is also necessary, to connect the verse with the "hope" mentioned in the context, which "maketh not ashamed." But what could have been more proper, than that such an outward manifestation to the senses should be considered as speaking powerfully to the affections, in a declaration of the love of God, to a people so highly favoured?"*

In the 8th chapter, there are sundry expressions, tending to the same point. There shall be mentioned only one of them. It is [verse 16] "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God." It is not the same with a witnessing "*to* our spirits;" as some delight to consider it, because of the support which it then seems to give to a favourite fancy; but "*with* our spirits." There are therefore two witnesses; one inward, which can be no other than the consciousness of an holy conformity to the divine will; and the other outward, which must have been the sensible effusion of the Holy Ghost; who is still a witness at the present day, in the testimony of the word and in no other way.

The matter is again implied in the 6th verse of the 12th chapter—"Having then gifts, differing according to the grace that is given to us; whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith." Commentators consider this, as significative of extraordinary endowments; although an application of the same to ordinary edification is the principal subject of the lesson given. The word "gifts," throughout the writings of St. Paul, is descriptive of what comes from the miraculous interposition of the Holy Ghost; standing thus distinguished from "the fruits of the Spirit;" which are the gracious endowments of the mind, or its moral habits. And there is probably another reference to the same effusion, in the 13th

* Dr. Whitby and some other commentators consider a sense of the love of God, as that which the Apostle affirms to be shed abroad in the heart. But this is here thought to detract from the weight of a sentiment otherwise very forcible; and besides, to make this one of the many places, in which he is represented as reasoning from insufficient principles. Any consciousness, existing in the minds of believing Gentiles, could be no evidence to believing Jews, of a point denied by them.

verse of the 13th chapter; where it is said—" Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, by the power of the Holy Ghost." For although " hope" is one of " the fruits of the Spirit," agreeably to the distinction already taken; yet it is not probable, that the Apostle would have made such an allusion to its source; if the Romans could have said at this period, what had been said by certain men in Ephesus, at a much earlier period—" we have not so much as heard, whether there be any Holy Ghost."

On the ground of those authorities, there is here rested the presumption, that there had been a miraculous effusion on some persons in the Roman Church; that there being, among the persons so favoured, some of the Gentile side of the question, there is inferred the impropriety of considering any as inadmissible to a participation of ordinary privileges, without a condition dispensed with by God himself, in the recipients of his highest gifts; and that, on this account, the Apostle should be considered as appealing to a past acknowledged fact, instead of expressing his persuasion of what could be brought to the test of the knowledge of himself, or of those to whom he wrote.

Unless indeed we adopt the construction here given, we seem to involve ourselves in a very considerable difficulty. For if the justification spoken of had been some process in the mind; and if the glorification spoken of were that of heaven; there might be asked—Had the Apostle a knowledge of the hearts of men, that he could positively affirm concerning such things as were the subjects of their respective consciousness? Or had heaven been so opened to his view, as that he could assuredly determine, on every question of an admission to its mansions? Or supposing him thus informed; was he possessed of such evidence, as must be satisfactory to the persons, whose prejudices he was combating? For we should bear in mind, that the Apostle is not addressing those alone, who were ready to receive what came from him, as the dictates of inspiration. Far from it; he was opposing by argument the errors of those, who were raising a clamour against his doctrine of a free admission of the Gentiles. And to suppose that he brought against those opponents arguments more liable to cavil, than the points which they were brought to prove; is inconsistent,

not to say with the dignity of the Apostleship, but with his personal character and accomplishments.

Besides; all that follows to the end of the chapter is in agreement with the interpretation given; while it shows no pertinency to any other sense. For the Apostle, strong in the reasonings which had run through several preceding chapters and bringing them to a point, applies them thus—(verse 31) "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who shall be against us?" That is; if he has thus, by a visible interposition of his power, publicly acknowledged us Gentiles to be of his people—for the Apostle, in this place, as elsewhere often, speaks of himseif as if he were one of those Gentiles, whose Apostle he had been divinely designated—who shall intervene between us and the gracious effects of this dispensation of providence, in our behalf? (Verse 32) "He that spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all; how shall he not, with him, also freely give us all things?" Here the Apostle, transported by his subject, combines it with the beneficent tendency of the Gospel generally. They against whom he wrote did not deny, that Gentiles might be admitted to Christian communion, although they contended, that it should be through the gate of legal ceremony. But says the Apostle, when God has manifested his impartial goodness, in so signal a display of it, as that of his Son's dying for Gentile as well as Jew; what wonder is there, that he should bestow on the former, as well the gifts which have been noticed to be already theirs, as any other which have a relation to their Christian calling; and this freely, without their being encumbered with the burthensome entailment of the Levitical law? He goes on—(verse 33) "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?" Chosen as we have been, under the public evidence of a divine designation; what mortal shall presume to accuse us, on the account of our not conforming to what they erroneously imagine essential to the profession of his name? (Verse 33) "It is God that justifieth;" (verse 34) "Who is he that condemneth?" It is the sovereign Judge, who has signified the acceptance of our persons, by tokens evident to sense: who then shall oppose his prerogative by the opposite judicial sentence of our condemnation? "It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." It

would have been in vain to have called the attention to these encouraging truths; had it been still uncertain, whether they were interesting to those whose cause was pleaded. But this being demonstrated by indisputable fact, the foundation of all Christian faith and hope is consistently introduced; as having been by that fact assured to them. The Apostle becoming still warmer on his subject, passes from those whose arguments drew a line of separation between Christian communion and the condition of uncircumcised professors of the faith, to another description of persons; meaning the common persecutors of them both: And then he enumerates the variety of trials, to which men were at that time exposed, by the profession of Christianity. There is no need to comment on the affecting passage; because, although it will come in properly under another department of the present work, it is not to the purpose in this place; any further than as a foundation of a remark; for the pointing out of what adds as well to the ornament, as to the argument of the passage; that the Apostle seems to insinuate to the Jewish disturbers of the peace of their Gentile brethren, a lesson to be drawn from the courage and the constancy with which they were enabled, by divine grace, to sustain the worst difficulties of the Christian warfare. This was in itself no small evidence of their being within the authorized pale of the profession; especially as those difficulties arose from the prejudice here contested; the opinion which the Jews entertained of the perpetual obligation of their law: the persecutions heretofore sustained having been brought on principally by the instigations of that people; and not, as afterwards, by heathen persecutors.

It would be rash to affirm, that a correct judgment has been expressed in every particular, as to the sense of the preceding passage. But there can hardly be an error in believing, that the Apostle, through the whole, contemplates persons of one description, opposing, censuring and condemning those of another; that he occupies himself in sustaining the rights of the latter; and that he appeals to some interposition of heaven, in their behalf. Now it seems impossible to imagine of whom the former character was designed, unless of the Jewish converts to Christianity; of whom the latter character was designed, but of the Gentile converts; and of what the divine

determination of the controversy was affirmed, but of that baptism of the Holy Ghost, which was to give beginning to the Church. If these things were so; the controversy must have been the terms of the admission of the Gentiles; they must have been contemplated and spoken of collectively; and the whole must have related to a visible fellowship on earth. If we abandon these points, for those of any other theory; there are no documents which can give us information, of one party setting up pretensions, to the prejudice of another; or of any dispute, in which either side would have found it determined against them, by St. Paul's teaching of Calvinism, in contrariety to Arminianism; or this, in preference to the other. In short; on any other hypothesis, he would seem to have given his Epistle a controversial form, when it ought rather to have been didactic. But as the former supposes the writer to have taken in matter quite foreign to his purpose, if he indeed treated of the subjects of modern controversy here in view; we must presume, that it was a plan which could not have been adopted, by such a writer as St. Paul.

The whole subject of this work was entered on with awe; on account of the variety of opinion, which has prevailed on it. But there is felt an increased measure of that affection, on passing to the 9th chapter of the Epistle; which has puzzled so many men, much abler than the present writer; and, what is far more to be deplored, has been the occasion of dejection and of despair to many: this, as is here thought, in consequence of interpretations which have no foundation in the passage. It is not the design to notice the various senses, which have been ascribed to the different verses in the chapter. Far from this, there will not be reviewed or reconsidered, to any considerable extent, what the author has heretofore taken the trouble to peruse; of the much greater proportion of which, he judges it better to be ignorant than to be informed.

The interpretation of part of the 8th chapter, makes a clear connection of it with the 9th; and it is difficult to devise any other interpretation, under which the connecting circumstance shall be seen. For if predestination, in the usual sense of the word, had been treated of in the latter part of the 8th chapter; and were to be resumed and more largely treated of in the 9th; it was foreign to the subject of those

passages, to mix it with that of the rejection of the Jews as a nation; since the predestinating act must still be understood to have included individuals from among them, as well as from among the Gentiles. But let the view be confined to national character and designation; and then, all is pertinent—all is sound argument.

The Apostle begins with a declaration, exciting the expectation of some afflicting truth to be disclosed. For after professing his own sincerity in this solemn form—(verse 1) "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost"—he adds—(verse 2) "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart." The cause of this great heaviness and continual sorrow was confessedly the rejection of the Jews, declared soon afterwards. Here was great cause, it must be confessed; although in the estimation of a mind susceptible of sympathy, nothing in comparison of the more dreadful and extensive reprobation, which it has been thought the object of this very chapter to affirm. Still, all for whom the Apostle feels in this place, are his countrymen the Jews. The passage, although partly given in the introduction, is here repeated at full length for the connection: "For I could wish [says he, verses 3, 4, 5,] that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption and the glory of the covenants and the giving of the law, and the service of God and the promises; whose are the Fathers; and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came; who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." There have been many ways thought of, to soften the harshness of this wish. The tense of the Greek verb [ηὐχόμην] admits the translation—I could have wished: meaning, if it were right to do so. Even with this softening; it seems impossible to suppose, that the Apostle admitted the idea, in relation to the subject of his eternal damnation. But if we apply it, as the whole spirit of the composition warrants, to an alienation from Christian communion; which, it should be remarked, might have consisted with circumstances excusing, in consideration of ignorance of the subject and want of opportunity of benefiting by it; under such a construction, the Apostle's saying that he could have wished this, if it were lawful, is within the reach of an emotion, descriptive of a mind

not vehement to excess; yet vehement as that of St. Paul was; evidences of which are found in various parts of what he has written.

Of the passage the last recited, it ought to be noticed, that it speaks of an adoption and of covenants, contemplated as comprehensive of a whole nation: so that there may be an adoption and there may be a covenant state, under which the temper and the life of the individual may be alien from the dispensation.

But even taking the privileges enumerated in the 4th and 5th verses, according to the construction given; it might occur to the advocate of Judaism, that, on the ground of the foregoing argument, the promises of God had now failed. But not so, says the Apostle—for this must be the meaning of the three verses following—since the promise is to have a more liberal construction, than to be confined to descent by natural generation. For if, as he goes on to show, it be clear concerning certain branches deriving their pedigree from the stock to which the promise had been made, that they were cut off from all interest in it, at a very early period; it may the easier be believed, that, agreeably to some intimation given in the promise itself; and to more express prophecies kept in reserve by the Apostle, to be produced in their proper places of this epistle; even persons, not claiming by descent, may attain to an interest in the promise.

Here, it is worth the while of every reader to make a pause; and seriously to ask the question; whether, consistently with the connection, there can be any thing to follow in regard to Ishmael and Esau, that can have respect to them personally, rather than to their posterities; or to the one or the other, as to what is to happen to them in a future life? To the writer of this, there seems nothing more unconnected with the past reasoning of the Apostle, than any matter relative to everlasting salvation under the Gospel. The question is of the description of persons, capable of being within its bounds.

As the connection points out this distinction; so it is further conspicuous in the terms in which the cases are brought before us, when compared with their correlative places in the Old Testament. For whereas it is stated, that there had been given to Abraham (verse 9) " the word of promise, at this time will

I come and Sarah shall have a son;" the same promised son is declared by the Apostle to have been preferred to Ishmael, another son of Abraham—preferred to him, says the Calvinistic system, as an heir of immortality. Now let it be remembered, that the Apostle is framing his argument, to the apprehension of persons acquainted with the Old Testament and believing in its divine authority; and further, that he bestows no pains to prove to them, that such was the sense of the record there found, concerning the setting aside of Ishmael. Was it then so clear to every reader of the Pentateuch, or is there any evidence of such a discovery made by Jews either of ancient or of modern times, that Ishmael is described in their sacred books, as having been cursed to all eternity? Let the narrative be examined; and let any trace of such an infliction, if found there, be produced. Abraham profers the modest suit to God —" Oh that Ishmael might live before thee!" God answers, that, although Abraham should have another and more favoured son; yet, in regard to Ishmael, it should be as had been desired. Oh faithful Abraham; little didst thou imagine, when thou receivedst this promise, from him who knew thou wouldest " command thy children after thee;" that, in the discrimination here made between Ishmael and his brother, there was contained the sentence of the eternal condemnation of the former! And little would it have consoled thee, under such an understanding of the allotment made to him, to have heard it added, that he should " beget twelve princes and become a great nation!"*

* It is probably owing to the evident designation of the posterity of Ishmael in Genesis, that there has been invented by some, as applicable to the passage in the Epistles, the distinction of a typical rejection, which was that of Ishmael and his posterity from an inheritance in Canaan; and an antitypical, which was of Ishmael himself from the poss bility of salvation. Whatever ground there might have been for this, had individual election and reprobation been the subject of the Apostle; the national complexion of his argument does away all pretence for it. There has been pressed into the service of the distinction stated, the allegory drawn by the Apostle, in the latter part of the 4th chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians. But that allegory runs a comparison between Sarah and Hagar, as representative not either of individuals or of nations, but of two covenants, the legal and the evangelical. Even what is said of Ishmael—(Gen. xvi. 12) " he shall be a wild man, his hand shall be against every man and every man's hand against him," has been brought in proof of the position of his reprobation. But does not the history of all succeeding ages harmonize with the idea, that this must have been designed to be descriptive of the national character of his descendants? And is not

From the case of Isaac and Ishmael, let us go to that of Jacob and Esau; concerning whom (verses 11, 12) "being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;" it was said—"the elder shall serve the younger:" and (verse 13) "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated," or esteemed him less.* That the elder's serving of the younger had reference to the present life only, must be evident on the face of the words. And that the hatred extended no further, is equally evident from the interpretation given to the word by the Prophet Malachi; where he introduces the Most High speaking thus (i. 2, 3.)—"I loved Jacob and hated "Esau; and laid his mountain and heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." And to show further, how foreign this is from the use made of it by some; it refers to the fortunes, not of the persons, but of their posterities. For when did Esau serve his brother Jacob? Or what evidence is there, of the wasting of the heritage of the former, in his own day? Every thing recorded of the brothers has a contrary appearance; especially their interview described in the 33d chapter of Genesis; and the account given in the 36th chapter, of the splendour of Esau's progeny; just before the mention of the incidents in the family of Jacob, which ended in his retreat to Egypt, where he lived and died dependent. The construction thus given to the 12th verse of the Epistle, is much confirmed by a reference to the 23d verse of the 25th chapter of Genesis; which the Apostle could never have intended to misquote, or to bend to a sense wide of the true one; but in which, what is said to Rebecca is expressly of "two nations and two manner of people, who were in her womb."†

the accomplishment of what was predicted of them continually appealed to by Christians, as a prominent proof of the spirit of prophecy in the scripture?

* That the word "hate" may be understood in this lax sense, may be gathered from St. Matt. vi. 24, and from St. Luke xiv. 26; besides many other places, as well in the Old Testament, as in the New.

† As in the case of the other two brothers, so, in the case of these, it has been contended, that, although there is a reference to their respective descendants, yet, that being the stocks of their families, they were parts of them and included in what is affirmed; and further, that the rejection of the family of Esau was typical of reprobation. And this is said on the presumption, so contrary to fact, that individual and not national allotment was the professed subject of the Apostle.

If we put out of view the national complexion of the composition here affirmed of it; what the Apostle says is much in favour of the Calvinistic and in contrariety to the Arminian scheme. For he grounds the fortunes of the brothers, not on their faith and their works foreseen, but on sovereign will. The advocates of the latter system seem to have no way of getting over the difficulty, but by the help of the truth here sustained; that individual character and everlasting life are not the direct object of the argument. Indeed, if they be, the authority of this passage extends further than is consistent with the Calvinistic doctrine; and thus proves too much. For, not being willing to admit, that the Divine Being will sentence an innocent person to perdition, the doctrine represents sin as no part of the decree, although a permitted mean for the accomplishing of the end of it. But in the case of Esau, the decree is unconnected with evil works; not only as foreknown; but as the medium, thought essential for the vindication of divine justice.*

The Apostle, however, is not done with the case of Jacob and Esau: for with the view to a prejudice which he supposed possible, he asks—(verse 14) "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?" answering his own question thus—"God forbid." It is here evident, that he so far treats the question with respect; as to imply, that the mind of man may lawfully inquire, concerning a mode of proceeding, ascribed to God, whether it be consistent with the righteousness, which must be an unalienable attribute of his nature. There

* Philip a Limborch, who is in general a judicious commentator, has taken pains, to clear this passage from the Calvinistic application of it, in reference to a future life. But to effect this, he is obliged to give a strained interpretation, wide of the Apostle's meaning. For he contends that the disregard of works spoken of in the 11th verse is merely to show, that, in respect to the election and the calling of any man into the Christian Church, his being within or without the Jewish economy was of no account. Limborch may be considered as a standard commentator of the remonstrant party in the Netherlands. How much must his and their cause have suffered, from the having considered this subject as at all connected with the reasonings of the Apostle.

The same respectable writer freely acknowledges, that the choice of Isaac and Jacob was a type of the election of the just; and the rejection of Ishmael and Esau, a type of the reprobation of the wicked. He contends, however, with apparent propriety, that their having been respectively types of these subjects does not prove, that they were examples of them. But why admit that they were types? They are only given as instances of the sovereignty of God, in the bestowing of favours incident to the present life.

are, indeed, many places in Scripture; in which the divine Being condescends to reason with his creatures, concerning the equity of his dealings and of his commands. The Calvinistic scheme itself, as already noticed, does not hesitate to judge, that God cannot justly damn his creatures, without previous sin. It must, then, be a mistake to suppose, that the Apostle treats it as an act of arrogancy, to compare an asserted effect of the sovereignty of God, with an obvious inference from his justice. No; it is contended, that there is no interference of the attributes. God may be more favourable to one, than to another; and yet just to all. But if the subject had respected everlasting salvation; the result would not have been so conspicuous, as is supposed in the Apostle's appeal to unprejudiced reason, for the truth of it.*

Nothing inconsistent with these sentiments is to be drawn from the 15th verse of the chapter; where the Almighty is

* Dr. Doddridge is so impartial as to renounce explicitly the application of this passage, to the eternal states of Jacob and Esau.

There seems to the writer of this, but one exception to the liberality, with which Dr. Doddridge avoided the making of the 9th chapter to the Romans at all tributary to the creed of his public profession. Throughout the whole of what he says before the 22d, 23d and 24th verses, he not only makes no application of the subject to a future state, but discharges from any such application the case of Esau expressly, in a note; and impliedly the case of Pharaoh, in the interpretation. But in regard to the said three verses, there is a note and there are some expressions in the improvement, which seem to construe them as of the conditions of individuals. What makes this the more remarkable; he resumes, under the next verse, the idea of national designation; and continues it to the end of the chapter. This respectable writer, in commenting on the three verses, pleases himself with the thought, as was natural for a man of his benevolent disposition, that there was a difference between that turn of the expression "fitted for destruction" and that of the other—"which he had afore prepared for glory." He seems to have considered this difference, as harmonising with the distinction between the direct act of predestination, with the effectual grace annexed to it; and the passing by: under which term there is supposed to be avoided a direct act of reprobation. The preparing of the righteous is ascribed to God; and the fitting of the wicked is represented as of themselves. But it is here thought, that there is no foundation for the criticism. The marginal reading for "fitted" gives the choice of "made up;" which presumes the act of God. And this is the more strict sense of "κατηρτισμενα." There seems no way of drawing the words from their subserviency to the belief of a direct act of reprobation; but by considering them designed, like all the rest of the chapters, of national character and condition.

It is the less to be wondered at, that the Calvinistic Dr. Doddridge should fall off, in a particular instance, from an adherence to the national and temporal properties of the Gospel; when even the Arminian Limborch is found occasionally mixing them with remarks individually applying.

quoted as saying, in Exod. xxxix. verse 19—"I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy; and will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." As the English word "mercy" is so much used in connection with the forgiveness of sin; it is probable, that even this circumstance may have sometimes contributed to an undesirable association of ideas, in a reader's mind. Both the Hebrew words in Genesis, and the Greek words in the Epistle, descriptive of certain affections in the divine mind, express grace—pity—kindness; without any especial connection with pardon. And this makes the declaration the more harmonise with the sentiment here sustained, of a peculiar designation of favour, relatively to the present life. The comment of the Apostle on the whole is—"So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God, that showeth mercy." (Verse 16.) This still refers to the relative circumstances of the brothers; particularly, to the elder's running in quest of the venison; and his eagerly coveting of the blessing; although in vain.

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

A Discourse, by the Rev. Thomas Y. How, A. M. an Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, New-York.

Rev. xix. part of the 10th verse—*The Testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.*

TO God alone it belongeth to look into futurity. Prophecy, therefore, is that sort of evidence which must irresistibly establish the divine origin of any system to which it is attached. When we see a long train of predictions clearly fulfilled, it is impossible to withhold our belief from the system which that train of predictions may have been given to attest.

In the first ages, miracle was the great evidence exhibited for the purpose of securing a favourable reception to divine truth. Prophecy is particularly calculated for the latter ages. It is, therefore, an accumulative evidence; and will continue to increase, in strength, and clearness, to the latest period of time.

In the consideration of this subject, it cannot be fair to dwell upon particular prophecies, and endeavour to magnify every little difficulty which they may involve. We shall never arrive at a true view of the subject, or be able to perceive its full force, until we regard prophecy as one great system centering in the Messiah. Accordingly, it is in this view that it is presented to us by the words of the text—"*The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy;*" that is, the great object of prophecy is to bear testimony to Jesus.

The same idea will be found repeatedly expressed in different parts of the sacred writings.

"*Search the scriptures,*" says our Saviour, "*for they are they which testify of me.*"

"*Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them, in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself.*"

"*These things which Gad hath showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.*"

It is evident, therefore, that the prophecies are not to be considered, merely, in a separate or detached point of light; but that they are to be regarded as forming one *great*, *connected*, and *harmonious*, scheme. In the words of the angel to St. John, "*the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.*

Let us take a rapid view of this interesting subject.

Prophecy, considered as a connected scheme pointing to the Messiah, relates, either to his first, or his second advent. It relates to our Saviour in person; or to the Church which he established, its fate and fortunes in the world.

To the first of these heads our attention will be confined.

No sooner does man fall from his state of innocence by transgression than the Saviour is promised. He is to be the *seed* of the woman. After the lapse of four thousand years this prediction is most wonderfully fulfilled. Jesus Christ is born, the son of a pure and immaculate virgin; being, literally, the seed of the woman.

Advancing in the sacred volume, we find this general promise to our first parents renewed to the Patriarch Abraham—"*In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*"

The prophecy continues to grow more and more particular. Isaac is selected to the exclusion of Ishmael; Jacob to the ex-

clusion of Esau. In the seed of each of these patriarchs blessing is to descend upon all the nations of the earth.

Again—The promised Messiah, who is to be the descendant of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, is further limited to the particular tribe of Judah; and not only so, but to a single family of that tribe. He is to be the son of David.

"*And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever.*" 2 Sam. vii. 11, &c.

"*I will settle him in mine house, and in my kingdom for ever; and his throne shall be established for evermore.*" 1 Chro. xvii. 14.

The great personage, here spoken of, can be none other than the promised Messiah, the Saviour of the world. That David understood the promise, in such sense, is evident from the prayer which he immediately offered to God on the occasion. And St. Peter and St. Paul both expressly speak of the promise as fulfilled in Jesus Christ. Acts ii. 30; ibid. xiii. 23.

From this period, moreover, it is to be observed, that the Messiah was expected, by the Jews, to appear in the family of David, and to sit upon his throne. And we find that the "Son of David" was the established title of the Messiah long before his appearance in the flesh.

Here, my brethren, let us pause a moment, and reflect on the connected scheme of prophecy, which, thus far, has been exhibited to our view.

The promised Messiah is to be the seed of the woman. He is to spring from an immaculate virgin.

Did prophecy stop here, it would, certainly, be entitled to great consideration. But, when the inspired writers go on, and represent the Saviour as the descendant of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; when they specify the tribe of Judah as that from which he is to spring, and David as his father, on whose throne he is to sit for evermore, the predictions acquire a clearness and force which irresistibly point us to God as their author.

You will observe, too, the propriety of considering prophecy

according to our text, as a connected scheme centering in the Messiah.

The characters, at first general, grow more and more specific, until they arrive at a point of particularity which renders misapplication impossible.

If the descent of our blessed Saviour, according to the flesh, be thus clearly ascertained; not less clearly ascertained are the time and place of his birth.

"*The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come: and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.*" Gen. xlix. 10.

The word SHILOH signifies the *Son*, the *Seed*, the *Sent;* and was always understood by the Jews as denoting the Messiah.

Here, then, is a most remarkable prediction, fixing the appearance of the Messiah to a period antecedent to the total destruction of the Jewish polity and state. These, at the birth of our Saviour, were still in existence, although beginning to depart; and, shortly after his death, they were utterly destroyed by the Roman power. Then the sceptre of Judah ceased to exist; *Shiloh* being come, and the Gentiles being gathered unto him.

Still more remarkable, in the present view of our subject, is the celebrated prophecy of Daniel.

"*Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.*" Dan. ix.

Every word here points us to the Messiah. Indeed, he is expressly mentioned, by name, as the great subject of the prediction.

"*Know therefore, and understand, that, from the going forth of the commandment to restore, and build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks. And after three score and two weeks the Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*" Dan. ix.

Time will not permit me to enlarge upon the several parts of this prophecy. Suffice it to observe, that the period of the ap-

pearance of the Messiah, and the period of his being cut off, are distinctly fixed; and that, with respect to each, the prophecy was most strikingly fulfilled. In seven weeks, or, according to the prophetical style, forty-nine years, after the going forth of the commandment, the Jewish church and state were restored and established. In sixty-two weeks more, Jesus Christ appeared on the earth as the Messiah; and so continued, first by his messenger John the Baptist, afterwards in person, during the remaining week of the period; thus making reconciliation for iniquity; sealing up the vision and prophecy; and causing the sacrifice and oblation to cease.

The words of the prophet Haggai, on this subject, are equally express and interesting.

"*I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of Hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine; the glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of Hosts.*" Haggai ii.

With this encouraging prediction did the prophet Haggai address the Jews desponding at the inferiority of the temple, which they were building, when compared with the splendid edifice erected by Solomon.

"*I will fill this house with glory—The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former: and in this house will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts.*"

The temple of Solomon was distinguished from the second temple, not only by its superior magnificence, but by many special marks of the favour of God; by the ark of the covenant; by the Urim and Thummim; and, particularly, by the visible symbol of the divine presence. Yet was it inferior in glory to the latter house; for, in that house, appeared the Messiah, the Saviour of the world.

Thus, then, the Messiah was to appear before the entire dissolution of the Jewish state.

He was to appear within four hundred and ninety years from the commandment to restore Jerusalem.

He was to appear before the destruction of the second temple, which he was to fill with his glory.

Accordingly, as the period thus pointed out by prophecy, approached, an universal expectation agitated the Jewish nation.

Even the Gentiles looked for some great personage to appear on the earth. The wise men of the East, guided by a supernatural star, proceed to Bethlehem to worship the new King of the Jews. And to Bethlehem these illustrious strangers are directed by the light of prophecy.

Having thus traced the descent of our Saviour, according to the flesh, through the lines of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; through the tribe of Judah, and in the family of David; having seen that the time and place of his birth were distinctly foretold; we proceed to remark, that his character, as the Messiah, was, by the ancient prophets, most clearly and strongly described.

The greatest extremes were to meet in his person.

At one time, he is denominated the Lord our Righteousness; the Mighty God; the Everlasting Father; the Prince of Peace. He comes to restore a lost world. He is to be the light of nations. He is to be mighty to save. At another time, he is represented as the scorn of men; as despised and rejected; as smitten and afflicted. He is to be a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief. He is to have no form, or comeliness, or beauty, that we should desire him.

How completely were these opposite characters united in Jesus Christ! He was both God and man; both a conqueror and a sufferer; exhibiting, on the one side, all the misery and humiliation of a persecuted victim; on the other, all the splendid characters of divinity.

How clearly, too, is Jesus Christ marked out as an expiatory sacrifice! As such he is figured by the Law; as such predicted by the Prophets. He is to make reconciliation for iniquity; to pour out his soul an offering for sin. He is to be cut off; but not for himself. He is to be wounded for our transgressions; to be bruized for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace is to be upon him; and with his stripes we are to be healed.

The great men of preceding dispensations, however illustrious, however crowned with the favour of God, were mere types of the Messiah. In Melchizedec, in Abraham, in Moses, in Joshua, in David, we behold shadows of the Saviour that was to come. Indeed, the whole history of the world seems to present only a scene of preparation for the birth of its

great Deliverer. Do nations rise to glory, or sink into decline? Is Cyrus girded with strength? Does Alexander march to the extremities of the earth? Does imperial Rome unite the reluctant nations under her powerful sway? It is all to prepare the way for the appearance of the Son of God upon earth, and for the establishment of his empire in the hearts of men.

Once more, we find a great number of minute events, in the life of the Saviour, expressly foretold.

He is to be betrayed by one of his disciples for thirty pieces of silver. He is to die on the cross. He is to suffer with common malefactors, and afterwards to make his grave with the rich. Vinegar is to be given him to drink. He is to be pierced with a spear. Lots are to be cast for his vesture. Not a bone of his body is to be broken. And many of these events, too, it is proper to remark, happened in direct opposition to the regular and accustomed course of things. For example—The punishment of stoning to death was the common punishment inflicted on the offence of which our Saviour was accused. Yet did he suffer on the cross. Again—It was the practice of the Romans to break the bones of the crucified malefactor. This was done in the case of the thieves who suffered with our Saviour; yet was no such indignity offered to him. And, here, let us recollect how completely he answers to the Paschal Lamb by which he was prefigured. Independently of the great points of similitude, on which time will not permit us to dwell, the Paschal Lamb was to be without blemish; and, of its body, not a bone was to be broken.

But, although the Saviour is to suffer and to die, yet is he not to see corruption. He is to rise from the dead. He is to ascend into heaven. In short, my brethren, to trace the prophecies, respecting the Messiah, as they occur in the Old Testament, is to relate the life of Jesus Christ, as it is recorded in the New.

We behold, then, a scheme of prophecy pervading all time; centering in one illustrious personage, and pointing to one great object, the restoration of a fallen world. Every thing, here, is grand; every thing, interesting; every thing, worthy of God. And now, what shall we say? Is this immense scheme of prophecy the mere result of unguided conjecture? Is it the offspring of sagacious calculation? Suppositions these too absurd

to be, for a moment, entertained by the candid mind! For, will any man pretend to compare the scheme of Pagan divination, with the scheme of Christian prophecy!

The Old Testament is full of Jesus Christ. We meet with him every where; in the Law; in the Psalms; in the Prophets. It is not merely in general terms that he is described. Every part of his life, and every feature of his character, is circumstantially delineated. A connected scheme of prophecy is carried on, during four thousand years, with increasing light and clearness; gradually advancing, from the morning dawn, to the fulness of meridian splendour. And at the very period of the birth of our Saviour, so distinctly had he been foretold, he is anxiously expected by a trembling world.

Well, then, may we exclaim, with the Centurion, truly this is the Son of God!

He comes invested with divine authority and power. As such, it is our duty to receive him, and to believe in him. God requires not of us an irrational faith. But, having sent his only begotten Son into the world, attended with the most convincing evidence of his divine mission and character, he commands us to believe in him; and he makes our belief in him a condition of salvation. We reject him, therefore, at our peril.

But, my brethren, something more is necessary than the mere assent of the mind to the proposition, that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, the Son of God. We must embrace him as a Saviour. We must apply his gracious offices to our souls. We must look to God, through him, for the pardon of our sins, and for the sanctification of our fallen nature.

Believe, then, in Jesus Christ. Receive him as a Saviour. In the spirit of penitence and love, embrace his cross; and, through the merits of that precious cross, you shall enter into everlasting life. Now to God, &c.

[*We invite the attention of our readers to the following treatise. It relates to some religious topics that are frequently, and with interest discussed among Christians. Mr. Knox, the author, was a* Presbyterian *Minister, and resided for several years in this country, but afterwards removed to the West-Indies, and died on the island of St. Croix. In the following republication of his letter, the introduction, and some other sentences are omitted which were not essential to the argument; and a note to the introduction is incorporated with the letter.*]

A Letter to the Rev. Mr. JACOB GREEN, *of New-Jersey, pointing out some Difficulties in the Calvinistic Scheme of Divinity, respecting* FREE WILL, DIVINE DECREES, PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, *&c. and requesting a Solution of them. By* HUGH KNOX, *Minister of the Gospel in the Island of Saba, in the West-Indies.*

[Continued from page 385.]

IF GOD exerts any influence, or presents any motive, upon which a sinful action of the creature must *necessarily* follow; if, moreover, we suppose this influence *exerted* or motive *presented intentionally* and with *design* to *produce* this sinful action, as a *necessary* and *essential* part of the *divine plan*, I cannot for my life conceive how the Most High can stand clear of the charge of being the *proper efficient cause* of such sinful action, and of the guilt of it (if indeed it could be supposed to have any guilt at all): for according to Mr. *Edwards* himself, *The first cause*, in every chain of causes, is the *proper cause* of the *last effect* flowing from such a chain. At this rate I cannot conceive of men otherwise than as *necessary agents:* as *wheels*, *weights* or *pullies* in the machinery of the system; and consequently as little the proper subjects of *praise* or *blame*, *reward* or *punishment*, as so many pieces of clock-work: nor do I know how to reconcile this scheme of thinking with *James* i. 13—15, and numberless other plain scriptures.

Is it absurd and inconsistent to suppose, that the ALMIGHTY could endow a rational creature with a power of determining his own volitions, without rendering such a creature thereby independent on himself? and, in order to ascertain GOD's ab-

solute sovereignty over this free creature, is it not sufficient to suppose that he perfectly foresees his free volitions and determinations; has him ever perfectly within the reach of his power, and can, by proper motives, suited to his rational nature and moral freedom, so influence, restrain, direct, or over-rule these volitions, as to make the tenor of his conduct comport with the general plan and design of his providence? Can we not conceive of GOD as decreeing or determining to make such a world as ours, and such creatures as we are; and as foreseeing by his all-comprehensive knowledge, the free volitions of his human creatures, and what course every individual of the species would take, according to their respective natures and circumstances? and can we not conceive of him as powerfully and efficaciously predisposing some of them, by proper motives and influences, to effectuate the *quantum* of good he intended; —and as putting it in the power of others to do good, if they chose it;—yet leaving them such a liberty of choice as he foresaw they *might*, yea, and *would* abuse, and thereby become the instruments of fulfilling the divine counsels by such volitions and actions as are morally evil, and in so doing, become justly *culpable* and *punishable?*

Although we acknowledge that GOD positively determined the sufferings and death of his *dear Son* for the redemption of human sinners; yet can we not suppose that he appointed this tragical event to happen in a time and place where he foresaw that many would be so desperately wicked, such abusers of their liberty, so criminally inattentive to the true character of the *Messiah* as laid down in ancient prophecy, and so blinded with prejudices of different kinds, as to reject *the holy One and the Just*, to thirst for his blood, and to *take, and with wicked hands to crucify and slay the* LORD *of Glory;* and thus, with the most *criminal* and *blameworthy* intention, to fulfil his high decree? Does it imply any absurdity or contradiction to suppose that the guilty actors in this tragedy; that *Judas*, *Pilate* and the *Jews*, had sufficient motives to *will* and *act* the very reverse of what they did; and that they had it in their power to comply with these better motives; and that their willing and acting upon different ones, was the *formal cause* of their *guiltiness* and *punishableness?* May we not suppose that many of these men, and *Pharaoh*, had, by grieving the Holy Spirit, whereby

they might have been sealed unto the day of redemption, out-sinned their day of grace; and that they were become the proper objects of divine dereliction, and were justly given over by GOD to a reprobate mind to work all manner of wickedness with greediness; and consequently that GOD might, consistent with his moral perfections, use these creatures, already *self-fitted for destruction*, as instruments to fulfil these his decrees —to the doing of which no more seems needful, than that GOD should leave these creatures (being no longer in a probationary state, any more than *devils*) to work *their own corrupt will*, and only over-rule them in working it? When a creature has out-sinned his day of grace, and is no longer a probationer for happiness; what absurdity is there in supposing that he may be employed by GOD, as the *devils* are, in doing the *drudgery* (if I may so express myself) of the universe?

By this scheme of thinking, if I mistake not, all the principal difficulties in the divine plan may be accounted for, and we shall steer clear of that *fatal concatinated* chain of motives which seems to bear so hard on *human liberty* and the *moral perfections* of GOD. We shall see how justly the wicked are blamed and punished for abusing a liberty which they might have used to better purposes;—and how justly *Pharaoh* and *Judas* and *Pilate*, who might have now been in glory, by complying with sufficient motives to virtue, are now *gone to their place* in consequence of their having made a different choice.

I am highly charmed with that idea of GOD whereby he is represented to the mind as a being of *infinite*, *essential* and *universal benevolence*. No scriptural definition of the Supreme Being pleases me more than that *laconic* and *expressive* one, of the beloved Apostle, "GOD *is* LOVE;" or that other more diffuse and circumstantial one, wherein he is pleased to declare his own nature; "The LORD, the LORD GOD, *merciful* and *gracious*," &c. And the psalmist has made such a representation of the exertion of this temper in GOD towards the creature, as, in my opinion, justifies the highest and warmest things we can say of it. "*He is good, and doeth good. The* LORD *is good unto* ALL, *and his tender mercies are* OVER ALL HIS WORKS." From this scriptural representation, I think, we must necessarily infer, that BENEVOLENCE is the *prime character* of the DEITY; that his goodness spontaneously flows out

to all the proper objects of it; that he never made, or could make, a creature to whom he did not primarily design happiness; and that even all those of his creatures, who, by sin, have forfeited all title to his *goodness*, *have been*, or *will be*, under a dispensation of his *mercy* (the *devils* perhaps only excepted, who having fallen from the highest state of dignity and felicity, without a tempter, are justly *reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day*)—otherwise it will be difficult to ascertain the full meaning of that emphatical expression; "*His tender mercies are over* ALL *his works.*"

What you say on this subject is, I think, *excellent*, and seems to imply all that I have advanced. "GOD existed when nothing else did; a being of infinite wisdom or intelligence; infinitely happy. His happiness consisting in the infinite rectitude of his nature, and the infinite love and delight of himself.—'GOD *is love.*'—Therefore if he exert himself or manifest himself *ad extra*, it must be according to the infinite rectitude, love and benevolence of his nature. If he exhibit himself in creation, and creatures can see him by that exhibition, it must be according to *what he is*, and not according to *what he is not;* that is, his exhibitions must appear to the creature, to be in *love* and *benevolence;* that is, in the end and issue of all things, they must and will appear so, to those who view things as they are. Now, as nothing can exist, or take place in being, but upon the divine plan and volition from eternity; I must suppose that every thing that exists, was best upon the whole, or the greatest display of the divine benevolence."—I, for my part, suppose so too: but how, my *dear Sir*, can this idea of GOD tally or comport with that *fatal chain* of *causal motives*, whereby a vast number of the fallen race of *Adam* are inevitably drawn into a state of endless misery, for the greater good of the system? If one of these miserable creatures is permitted to "see GOD in this exhibition of him," and his faculties are not supposed to be totally changed from what they are at present; can he say *in truth* that GOD is *good unto* ALL; that he hath been good and merciful unto him? Is this consistent with the above idea of the divine benevolence? Or, can infinite wisdom find no other expedient to promote the *general good of the system*, than by ordering and planning things so, that a considerable

part of it shall, without any *dispensation of mercy* and *proper state of trial*, be doomed to eternal torments, by an *absolute* decree of *preterition* in a state of hereditary corruption and misery, from which they never had it put within the reach of their power to deliver themselves, or to be delivered? Does this seem consistent with our natural notions of divine *equity*, much more of his *benevolence to all*, and those *tender mercies* of his, which are *over all his works?* Or is it fair and charitable to suspect men of *want of humility*, or holding a system inconsistent with the proper *sovereignty of* GOD and *dependence of the creature*, who hesitate to adopt such a scheme of thinking as this? Surely we ought to be persuaded, upon the most *convictive* and *infallible* evidence, that the soul of man hath no *self-determining power;* no liberty of *choosing* or *refusing* the objects set before it, before we can be warranted to gvie up, with all these, our *natural* and *scriptural* notions of GOD's *rectoral justice* and *paternal benevolence* to his creature, in order to make room for such an idea of the divine sovereignty, as is *unamiable* in itself, and seems to strike *such a fatal blow* at the very vitals of moral agency! It tends, in my opinion, greatly to embarrass and mislead in this dispute, to compare the soul of man, in its acts of volition, to *inanimate things* and *necessary agents*, such as *chains*, *scales* and *balances*, moved by *weights*, and the like. What comparison or similitude can there be between a *material*, *inanimate machine*, and a *living*, *active*, *conscious immaterial substance*, bearing the natural image of GOD? Or how can the mode of agency or operation in one of these things, be even illustrated or made more intelligible, by the mode of agency or operation in the other? Mr. *Edwards*'s doctrine of the necessary connection between moral effects and their causes; i. e. the motives which produce them, is indeed an *intricate* and *perplexed* piece of work; and here I am apt to suspect the fallacy in his whole subsequent reasoning originates; For can it indeed be proved absurd to suppose GOD capable of making a creature, which, after its being brought into existence, should be *self-moving* and *self-determining;* so far the *source* and *cause* of its own actions, as to render it properly accountable for these actions: and this, without supposing the *necessity* of its being irresistibly weighed down by motives, as a *scale* is by *weights*, or dragged

about hither and thither as a *puppet* by *wires*, or a *chain* by the hand of a *superior intelligence?* Or, can nothing but such a creature as this be supposed absolutely dependent on its Maker; or a proper subject of moral government? Is it not sufficient to ascertain the *proper dependence* of a human soul upon GOD, that he has made it, and given it its powers (one of which is a liberty of choice)—that he foresees its free volitions, and *can* and *does*, control and alter them when he pleases? And if man were such a creature as this, could it be said, with any propriety, that man is *independent* on GOD?

It is to me a very small matter, in this controversy, what *quantum* of evil there is in the universe by the fault of *men* or *devils*, provided GOD can be exculpated from the charge of having any *causality* in producing it, and that his ways to man can be vindicated: So that he shall appear, to right reason, *just* and *holy*, *true* and *sincere*, in all his dealings and transactions with his creatures. And to make this appear in a *clear* and *unexceptionable* light, upon your principles, at the same time removing the main objections I have alleged against them, will be a *proper* and *satisfactory* answer to this letter, and will put an agreeable end to the controversy.

* * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * *

I would here, once for all, beseech you to consider me in the humble capacity of a *learner* in the present controversy, and not as a *pertinacious disputant* wrangling for victory. The truth is great, and will prevail. This is my wish and earnest desire, both with regard to my own case, and the whole Christian Church. If, therefore, in any passages of this letter I may seem to push matters *too far*, or with *too much warmth*, I intreat you not to misconstrue such passages, either into want of reverence for the *sacred subjects of controversy*, or rudeness to *you*. The former I *dread* and *abhor;* of the latter I hope you would not suspect me. I have such a firm persuasion of your *piety*, and such a respect for your *judgment* and *candour*, as will, I hope, ever keep me at the greatest distance from uncharitableness, either in thought or language. Besides; there breathes such a spirit of *kindness* and *goodness* through all your letters, as secures both my affection and gratitude. I highly venerate men of worthy character, though of different sentiments; believing

they may all be right in *fundamentals*, or innocently mistaken in *non-essentials:* but I can call no man *master*, save CHRIST alone. Great names, great abilities, or even great piety and grace can be of little weight with me, in forming my religious sentiments, so long as I continue to believe that no *mere man is infallible* in his judgment. If, therefore, I shall be thought in this letter, to have pushed some matters as far as they will bear, and with some appearance of warmth and attachment to a favourite system; it is with design that they may appear in the *strongest light*, and thereby extort from you the more satisfactory *eclaircissement*. Nor shall I dread to see my own opinions set in the most *absurd*, *ridiculous* or *blasphemous* light they will bear, provided I may be thereby convicted of their *falsity* and *dangerous tendency*.

* * * * * * * * * * *

* * * * * * * * * * *

As to your last printed sermon,* I think it would be, *in the main*, and with *some alterations*, an excellent one, from a person in my present way of thinking. The distinction between *natural* and *moral* inability, I have ever thought an important and useful one, when well stated and explained. My worthy and excellent friend, President *Burr*, was the first who ever gave me an idea of this distinction. He did it in three sermons preached from *Joshua* xxiv. 19. "*Ye cannot serve the* LORD: *for he is an holy* GOD," &c. He acknowledged they were the substance of Mr. *Edwards*'s book relative to that subject, and expressed a pretty strong desire of having them printed, as some of the most useful and important he had ever preached. All the world I suppose are agreed in the idea of *natural inability;* and were I to define *moral inability*, it would be in terms like these: "A natural and contracted disinclination or aversion to the exercises of piety and moral virtue, which becomes faulty and criminal by our resisting motives which would have overcome it, and wilfully neglecting to apply to GOD through the REDEEMER, by prayer and the other instrumental duties of religion, for those influences of his HOLY SPIRIT (freely offered to all who seek them) by which it would have

* Entitled "*The Sinner's Faultiness, and Spiritual Inability,*" from *Rom.* ix. 19. Printed at *New-York*, 1767.

been totally subdued, and our volitions and actions engaged on the side of piety and moral rectitude."—But now, seriously, on the scheme of a *particular redemption* (into which, I believe you yourself, and all my brethren with you, have gone*)

* You'll pardon me, *my dear Sir*, for this mistake concerning your opinion, and that of my brethren in your neighbourhood. I made it on a presumption that you were thorough Calvinists, in the sense in which that doctrine is taught by *Calvin*, *Turretine*, *Pictete*, *Witsius*, *Usher*, and other school divines. Your sentiments, and those of our brethren, on this article, are very *generous*, *catholic*, and *unexceptionable* indeed, and such as I have no objection against. You say, "The most, if not all, your brethren in the ministry, are *so large* in their notions of *redemption*, that you suppose I would have no controversy with them, on that head;——and that as to yourself, you suppose, you are somewhat peculiar, being *more an universal Redemptionist* than any of them. You suppose that your notion of CHRIST's redemption is more extensive than mine.—That CHRIST's death and atonement was for all the human race. His death, you suppose, was not to purchase the love of GOD, nor the influences of the Spirit—but to open a way to save sinners, consistent with GOD's justice and holiness—to show the evil of sin, to vindicate GOD's government, and the honour of his laws. You suppose also that it was the *deobstruent* cause of the Spirit's influences. It was, that the goodness of GOD might flow to any of the human race, without eclipsing the glory of any of the divine perfections. *By this* the way is opened for *all mankind* to come to GOD, through JESUS CHRIST. The design of CHRIST's death," you say, "may be considered as the same, whether a greater or a smaller number of *Adam*'s race be finally saved by him." You declare, in *short*, "that in your view of things, you have no difficulty in saying, that CHRIST's death and atonement was EQUALLY *for all mankind*." No universal Redemptionist, not even *Arminius* himself, ever went beyond this. I find, therefore, that I have no controversy with you, on this head; and therefore that part of my letter which combats *particular redemption*, is only permitted to continue in the letter, for the sake of those whom I take to be thorough Calvinists in this article. I wonder, however, that "you are ready to suppose I misunderstand the Calvinistic writers on this head;" though you grant it "possible that there may be a *real opposition* between them and me." Indeed, *Sir*, I think I do not misunderstand them: But least I should be mistaken, I refer the candid reader to *Calvin*'s institutions, *Turretine*, *Pictete*, and almost all the systematic Calvinist writers, on the articles of the *divine decrees*, *predestination*, *election*, *reprobation* and *redemption*; also to *Edwards* on the *five points*. But, *my dear Sir*, the more you are of an *universal Redemptionist*, the more difficult I find it to conceive of the consistency of your principles. The system of the ancient Calvinists is *well jointed*, and hangs together, be it *right* or *wrong*. But to tack universal redemption, in the sense you hold it, to Mr. *Edwards*'s doctrine of the will, and make them consistent, requires, in my opinion, a great deal of ingenuity indeed.

Calvinism, I find, while it still denominates a sect, has greatly and almost essentially changed its nature since *Calvin* wrote. The generality of the first reformers in *England* and *Scotland* were *supra-lapsarians*. *Calvin* himself (so well as I remember, for I have not his institutions by me) and the most of the Calvinists about the beginning of the present century, were *sub-lapsarians*. But *Calvinism*, as now generally embraced by President *Edwards*'s admirers, seems to me as different from *original Calvinism*, as it is from *Arminianism*. It seems to me some *middle thing*, patch'd up of both; and that, if it must

I see no propriety at all in this distinction, as held forth to the hearers of the gospel in general. I would first point out what I take to be an error in your definition of *natural inability*. You say, repeatedly, *pages* 15, 17, &c. of your sermon, that "natural inability is the *want of power*, or *faculty* to do what persons have *a will* to do, what they choose and desire to do—that it *always* supposes some impediment or insurmountable difficulty in the way, where there is a *will, desire and heart to and for a thing.*" I think the last clause of this definition, printed in *italics*, should be wholly omitted: For I imagine that an *insurmountable obstacle* or a *natural impossibility* of our doing any thing, whether our *heart* or *will* be *for it*, or *against it*, fully constitutes our natural inability of performing that thing. e. g. I am naturally unable to remove a mountain, whether I *will* and *choose* it or *not*. My *willing*, or *not willing*, makes no manner of odds in my *power* or *ability*. The thing is wholly beyond any *natural power of mine*.

The same will, in my opinion, holds equally true in *moral* or *spiritual*, as it does in *natural* difficulties. If there be any *insurmountable obstacle* in my way, to any moral or spiritual attainment, it is, in the nature of things, wholly as impossible for me to remove *this obstacle*, as to remove *the mountain*.

Having thus abridged this definition to what I think its true and natural limits, I would farther say—That, upon the scheme of a particular redemption, it is *as impossible* for the *non-elect* or *reprobate*, to be saved, or to *do* or *obtain* any thing *spiritually good*, as it is for me to remove a mountain; so that the *moral inability* they are under, is to all intents and purposes, a *natural one:* for were it even possible that they could have a *will* and *desire* to be saved, yet are they under a *natural impossibility* of salvation;—for *them* no Saviour was intended or provided;—to *them* no Saviour was sent;—for *them* no Saviour died;—for

have a name, it should be called *Edwardism*. I would that the Protestant world could be prevailed on wholly to drop these invidious nominal distinctions, which almost ever affix the idea of *heresy* or *damnable error* to the opposite party. I think it a violation of that law, whereby we are commanded to *call no man master, save* CHRIST. Though I believe myself to be more of a *Calvinist* than an *Arminian*, yet I disclaim both these appellations, as I can subscribe to neither of these great men throughout. And for the like reason, I think *you*, and *my brethren with you*, should do the same. It is enough, if we are *Christians* indeed.

them was no spirit purchased,—and to *them* no salvation is *really* and *sincerely* offered. It is then *ipso facto* impossible for them to *believe*, *repent*, or do any thing spiritually good, or to obtain any power of doing these things; and much more *to be saved.* I do not mean, that they have no such power *in themselves;* for in this respect, all are on a footing; but there is an *insurmountable obstacle* in the way: the thing *cannot* be: and therefore, by your own concession, they must be wholly blameless in not believing, repenting, &c. i. e. in not doing *natural impossibilities.* If, to this it is answered, as it generally is by Calvinists, that man, by his apostacy, has brought this *impotency* upon himself; and that man's having lost his ability of doing good, does not deprive GOD of his just requisitions upon man; so that GOD *may justly* and *equitably* enjoin many duties upon man, which he hath now, through his apostacy, no power of performing:—that these commands are *just* and *equitable* in themselves, and therefore may be, and ought to be enjoined on an impotent creature, and the like; I will more particularly consider this matter below. I would at present observe,

That the scriptures seem to lay the grand cause of *guiltiness* and *condemnableness* in sinners, not so much on their original apostacy and the corruption of their nature, as upon their not coming to CHRIST as their Saviour, and believing in him, and complying with his saving design, and cherishing the motions of his spirit, and repenting of their sins, and doing something which GOD hath graciously put it in their power to do, and which he is continually *disposing* and *exciting* them to do; continually *working* or *operating in them, both to will and to do* the things that are pleasing to him. The gospel seems uniformly to offer salvation to the *greatest* of sinners, to *all* sinners, and to tell them, without exception or limitation, that a Saviour is provided for them, and that it is some how or other *wholly* their own fault if they do not come to him, and embrace him, and be saved by him: all which must be *absolutely false* and *shamefully trifling*, if CHRIST did not die for *all* sinners, and if the benefits of his death were not put properly within the reach of *all* gospel sinners, without exception; or if there were any *natural* or *insurmountable obstacle* put in the way of the salvation of *any* such sinner, by *decrees*, *fatal concatenation of*

irresistible motives, or otherwise. So that if there be any truth in this remark, then, either the Calvinistic doctrine of particular redemption is *antiscriptural* and *absurd*, or the distinction of *moral inability* is applicable only to the *unconverted elect*, and is very *improper* and *untrue* when addressed to the hearers of the gospel promiscuously, as applicable to them all.

Indeed, I have always deemed it either *dishonest* or *trifling*, in *particular Redemptionists*, to address the offers of the gospel to *all in general*, and to urge all in general to *believe in* CHRIST, *repent*, &c. with a solemn assurance that no obstacle stood in the way of the salvation of any sinners of *Adam*'s race, but their own perverseness and unwillingness to come to CHRIST, that they might have life. I have such an abhorrence of *insincerity*, that, I protest, were I into this scheme of thinking, I should think myself obliged to preface every discourse in which the offers of salvation were made to sinners, with some such declaration as this: "My poor fellow-sinners, GOD hath, of his sovereign pleasure, chosen some of the corrupt mass of mankind to eternal life, and hath passed by the rest, and left them to perish everlastingly without remedy. Who this happy number are, we know not: but in hopes that some of them may be among my audience, who are still in their sins, I am commissioned, in the name of GOD, to make these offers *to such*, being assured that one time or other, they will be called by his grace, and have their *moral impotence* and *inability* removed by this call.—As to the rest of you, whoever you are, your case is *irremediable* and *desperate*. You have no claim to these tenders, nor can you have any part in this gospel salvation. Nevertheless, it will be your duty quietly to acquiesce in, and even to approve of, this disposal of things, as your eternal misery will be so over-ruled as to promote the *general good of the system*, and to manifest the glory of the divine sovereignty in the final issue of things. Yet, as it is impossible for any of you to know, in particular, that you are the unhappy persons; you are all, without exception, commanded and invited by the *external call* of the gospel, to *believe*, *repent* and be *converted;* and these invitations and commands being *reasonable* in themselves, though a compliance with them be *impossible* to you, your *non-compliance* with them will justly aggravate your eternal misery."—Yet, *my dear and very worthy friend*, were I *thus persuaded*, methinks

I would publish these glad tidings to my fellow sinners with an heavy heart and a faultering tongue; conscious that many of them were under a *natural impossibility* of embracing them, and yet were liable to an *increased condemnation* for rejecting them: for, *he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God.* John iii.

*The chief of these objections may be inferred from the following reasoning: "All men without exception or distinction are invited and commanded to come unto CHRIST and believe in him. All sober Calvinistic divines believe it to be the indispensable duty of all sinners, without exception, to obey these commands and comply with these invitations, and that they are justly condemnable and punishable in not doing so. They affirm (as CHRIST has done before them) that their not coming to CHRIST and believing in him, is *the formal cause* and an aggravating circumstance of their condemnation: *Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins. This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world,* and *men loved darkness rather than light.* He *that believeth on* CHRIST *is not condemned: but he that believeth not, is condemned already,* BECAUSE *he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of* GOD. *He that hath not, and believeth not, the Son, shall not see life,* but *shall be damned.* It is also pretty generally allowed by Calvinistic divines, that to *come to* CHRIST and *believe in him*, implies in it not merely a belief that he is the only Saviour of human sinners in general, but that he *died for us*, and is *our Saviour* in particular, at least *in offer.* And indeed the very nature of faith; the very duty of *coming to* CHRIST and *believing on him*, seems necessarily to imply thus much in it, namely, THAT we come to him and apply to him under a firm persuasion that he is *our Saviour in offer*, and that we rely upon him, under this character, for redemption and remission of sins through his blood: for it is utterly inconceivable how we should *come to him, apply to him,* or *believe on him*, under any other notion, than that he *is our Saviour*, and that we *may* obtain salvation

* This paragraph in the original text was inserted in a note to the introduction of the letters.

by and *through him.*—But now, if the Calvinistic doctrine of particular redemption be true, as it is taught by a great number of the ablest and most eminent divines, it would appear to follow from their own doctrines, that GOD commands *reprobate* or *non-elect* sinners TO BELIEVE A LIE; not only so, but that he condemns them and increases their condemnation FOR NOT BELIEVING THIS LIE; namely, that CHRIST died for *them;* is *their* Saviour; with all his benefits, is sincerely offered to their acceptance; and that if they would come to CHRIST and believe on him, *they might* have redemption and eternal life through his name. Whereas, according to their doctrines of *particular redemption* and *reprobation*, CHRIST never was the Saviour of reprobate or non-elect sinners, either in intention or offer, and never died *for them*, any more than *for devils.* They do indeed talk of many *benefits* and *advantages* which the *non-elect* enjoy by CHRIST, as life and all its blessings, this world and all its enjoyments, the *means of grace*, and a short respite from hell. But seeing all these supposed benefits only give them opportunity of aggravating their condemnation, by their continuing in unbelief and impenitency under that gospel, which can never profit them, the glad tidings of salvation by a Redeemer, together with present life and all its enjoyments, are so far from deserving the name of *benefits*, that, upon the whole, they are *great* and *real disadvantages* to *all such*, and must needs be so, in the very nature of things.

(To be continued.)

Thoughts on various Subjects, and from various Authors. By Bishop Horne.

[Continued from page 377.]

CHINESE.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS of every kind are acquired and preserved by use and practice; and the Scholar and Christian would do well to reflect upon a piece of discipline in the Chinese armies, by which a soldier who suffers his arms to contract the least *rust* is punished on the spot with thirty or forty blows of the batoon.

CHRISTIANITY.

1. With difficulty men are induced to give up their favourite opinions: still harder is the task to draw them from their favourite vices.—Could a religion be less than divine, which caused the Heathen world to quit both?

2. "Religion," say some, "was invented by priests and politicians, to keep the world in order." It is a good thing, then, for that purpose at least. But the misfortune is, none of the supposed impostors of this kind have ever been named, who lived till *after* the general principles of religion were found disseminated among mankind, as the learned Stillingfleet shows at large (Orig. Sac. b. i. chap. 1.) even from the testimonies of the Egyptians and Greeks themselves.

3. In Constantinople behold the judgments of God on apostates from true religion, and corrupters of it; see Jews and Christians perpetrating on each other the most enormous villanies, as the price of obtaining the favour of the Turks! At the same time behold the Greek prelates, even while groaning under the yoke of the oppressor, employing their time, their wealth, and their interest, in over-reaching and supplanting each other for a metropolitan see, or a patriarchate, at the court of that oppressor!

4. Christianity has, in every age, produced good effects on thousands and tens of thousands, whose lives are not recorded in ecclesiastical history; which, like other history, is for the most part a register of the vices, the follies, and the quarrels of those who made a figure and noise in the world. Socrates, in the close of his work, observes, that, if men were honest and peaceable, historians would be undone for want of materials.

CHURCH.

1. The enemies of the Church are encouraged to proceed in their attacks, by the timidity of her friends; as Lysander, at the siege of Corinth, bade his men be of good courage, when he saw a hare run along upon the walls.

2. Learned and good men are often deterred from engaging the adversaries of religion, more through fear of their ribaldry than their arguments; as Antipater's elephants, which beheld the apparatus of war unmoved, ran away at the grunting of the Megarensian hogs.

3. To admit all the jarring sects and opinions into the Church by a *comprehension*, would be, as one well observes, to jumble together an indigested heap of contrarieties into the same mass, and to make the *old chaos* the plan of a *new reformation*.

4. Those clergymen who betray the cause of their Master, in order to be promoted in his Church, are guilty of the worst kind of simony, and pay their souls for the purchase of their preferments.

5. Heresies seem, like comets, to have their periodical returns.

6. Some think variety of religions as pleasing to God as variety of flowers. Now there can be but one religion which is true; and the God of truth cannot be pleased with falsehood, for the sake of variety.

7. Nothing is more common than or a religious or political sect to disclaim a principle, and then resume it under another form: as the *Circoncelliones* used no *swords*, because God had forbidden the use of one to St. Peter; but they were armed with clubs, which they called the clubs of Israel, and with which they could break all the bones in a man's skin. See Le Beau, i. 170. See Jortin's Remarks on Eccl. Hist. iv. 388.

8. The heat and acrimony with which some men write against revelation remind one of the cruelties practised by the above mentioned fanatics, who covered the eyes of the Catholics that fell into their hands with *lime* diluted with *vinegar*. Ibid.

9. Upon viewing many of our places of worship in the country, one would be tempted to think the Church of England had adopted the maxim laid down in a neighbouring kingdom, "That cleanliness is not essential to devotion." A church of England lady once offered to attend the kirk there, if she might be permitted to have the pew swept and lined. "The pew swept and lined!" said Mess John's wife; "my husband would think it downright popery!"

10. If the intended reformation of our liturgy goes on, the reformers may hereafter bring us in a bill like that of the Cirencester painter:

Mr. Charles Terebee to Joseph Cook, debtor.

	l.	*s.*	*d.*
To mending the Commandments, altering the Belief, and making a new Lord's Prayer,	1	1	0

11. The person presiding over a church should diligently

mark the very first starting of an error, or heresy, and employ a proper hand immediately to check and extinguish it; as, by order of the New River Company in London, a watchman is nightly fixed at such a height, near the river head, as to be able to overlook the whole town, and, on the momentary appearance of any conflagration, to turn the water full on the mains leading to the respective quarter, however remote the situation: by which wise and commendable measure, the water generally arrives at the place of destination before the fleetest messenger.—Morning Chronicle, Jan. 27, 1781.

12. "As I do not check any suspicions in my own mind, I "shall not easily be restrained from uttering them; because *I* "*know not how I shall benefit my country, or assist her coun-*"*sels by silent meditations.*"—Pulteney, in Johnson's Debates, vol. i. p. 5. A friend of the *Church*, who is able to write or speak, in these days, should make the same reflections.

13. A right good man may be a very unfit magistrate; and, for discharge of a Bishop's office, to be well minded is not enough; no, not to be well learned also. Skill to instruct is a thing necessary, skill to govern much more necessary in a Bishop. It is not safe for the Church of Christ, when Bishops learn what belongeth unto government as empirics learn physic, by killing of the sick. Bishops were wont to be men of great learning in the laws both civil and of the Church; and while they were so, the wisest men in the land for counsel and government were Bishops.

COLLINS, (ANTHONY)

This person, on his death-bed, was under great anxiety, and, just before he expired, with a deep sigh, pronounced the following words—*Locke has ruined me!* His niece, who attended him at the time, related this circumstance to Mr. Wogan, the pious author of an Essay on the Proper Lessons; as he assured a friend of mine, the Rev. Dr. Merrick of St. Ann's, Soho.

COMPOSITION.

1. He that would write well in any tongue, must follow this counsel of Aristotle;—to think with the learned, but speak with the common people, that these may understand, and those approve him.

2. Aptness, knowledge and use make all things perfect; but they must join forces or nothing will be well done. The first is the gift of God; the second we must have from others; the third we attain by our own diligence and labour.

3. The same arguments are quite different in their effects, when drawn up and urged by a man of genius. They go farther, and pierce deeper, like the shafts of Hercules, which, Hesiod tells us, were winged with eagles' feathers.

4. He, who would excel in any thing (oratory *e. g.)* must not servilely copy any one orator throughout, but from different persons select the accomplishments for which they are severally eminent.

5. It was Cicero's opinion, that he who would speak well, must write much:

Caput autem est, quod (ut vere dicam) minime facimus, (est enim magni laboris, quem plerique fugimus) quam plurimum scribere. De Orat.—But the principal point is one from which most of us shrink, on account of the labour that attends it; I mean frequent and much composition.

6. Depth of sentiment, illustrated by a bright imagination, is like the sea when the sun shines upon it and turns it into an ocean of light.

7. Illustrations are peculiarly beautiful, where they are fetched from something near akin to the subject which they are employed to adorn: as *e. g.* Sprat's observations on the age of learning among the Arabians—"Methinks that small spot of civil "arts, compared to their long course of ignorance before "and after, bears some resemblance with the country itself; "where there are some few little vallies, and wells, and pleasant "shades of palm trees; but those lying in the midst of deserts "and unpassable tracts of sand." Hist. of Roy. Soc. p. 45.

8. Zeuxis, the famous painter, before he sat down to a picture, used to animate his fancy by reading some passage in Homer relative to his subject.—A good hint to those who are about to compose in prose and verse.

9. Every man has a certain manner and character in writing and speaking, which he spoils and loses by a too close and servile imitation of another; as Bishop Felton, an imitator of Bishop Andrews, observed—"I had almost marred my own "natural trot, by endeavouring to imitate his artificial amble."

10. It was a rule with Archbishop Williams, to give himself some recreation before he sat down to compose, and that in proportion to the importance of the composition.—See his life in Lloyd's Worthies, p. 379.—Dr. H. More, after finishing one of his most laborious and painful works, exclaimed—"Now "for these three months, I will neither think a wise thought, "nor speak a wise word, nor do an ill thing."—Life in the Biog. Dict.

11. In an oration, one would wish that the whole should be well composed, and suitable to the dignity of the subject. But let the progress to what is great and brilliant be gentle and gradual. Such is the rule and method of Nature in all her works. At the first dawning of the brightest day that ever shone, light and darkness were scarcely distinguishable.

12. In compositions, young writers produce the most, but old ones the best, as Lord Bacon observes of grapes—"The "vine beareth more grapes when it is young, but grapes that "make better wine when it is old; for that the juice is better "concocted."

13. Style should resemble the atmosphere of Italy, which "embellishes all objects by showing them with clearness; for "which reason, its gulfs, its woods, its cascades, and its meads, "have a grace unknown beneath other skies."

14. The author of Hudibras had a common-place-book, in which he had reposited, not such events or precepts as are gathered by reading; but such remarks, similitudes, allusions, assemblages, or inferences, as occasion prompted, or meditation produced; those thoughts that were generated in his own mind, and might be usefully applied to some future purpose. Such is the labour of those who write for immortality.

15. Augustus loved correctness and accuracy in all his compositions, and never delivered his mind on any serious matter, even in his own family, without memorials or written notes. Ferguson, Rom. Hist.—A method practised and recommended by Bolingbroke and Chesterfield, to attain a habit of correctness in speaking.—So Bishop Atterbury of *writing*, "Let "nothing, though of a trifling nature, pass through your pen "negligently." Letters, i. 118.

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

EPISCOPACY VINDICATED:

In a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. MILLER, *by the Rev.* JAMES KEMP, *D. D. Rector of Great Choptank Parish, Dorchester County, Maryland.*

[Continued from page 359.]

LETTER IV.

Testimony of the early Fathers.

Preliminary Observations. Clemens Romanus. Hermas. Polycarp. Ignatius. Papias. Irenæus. Justin Martyr. Clemens Alexandrinus. The principal Positions of Dr. Miller taken from Lord King. Result of the Examination of the Fathers.

REV. SIR,

WE are now ready for the Fathers. And here I find, that, with your usual address, you have fixed positions and made claims in the name of Episcopalians, which do not strictly belong to them. This gives the appearance of much fairness to your manner of arguing, and is calculated to injure the cause of your opponents. I will endeavour not to follow your example: for when I state principles, I shall resort to your Church, and not to individuals; when I controvert arguments, I shall confine myself to yours; and not form for you premises of such a nature as to help to desired conclusions.

In however high veneration Episcopalians hold the Fathers, they do not resort to them as a rule either of *faith* or *practice*. But as some of them were taught Christianity by the Apostles themselves; as most of them lived at, or near the Apostolic age, and must have known the opinions, the errors, and the usages that then prevailed, and to which there are frequent allusions in Scripture; we hold the writings of these primitive ministers to be highly useful, in assisting us to ascertain the true meaning of Scripture.

The only point, upon which the present question depends, is,

whether the Fathers are to be received as *credible witnesses of facts*, which must have come within their knowledge. This you grant. And as you have limited this credibility to the "*first two centuries*," for my part, I will also meet you upon that ground; although I could, in many instances, rely upon the correctness of persons, in relating matters of fact, whom I believed to be heterodox in their opinions.

You are indeed much mistaken, when you say, that Episcopalians, when they find passages in the Fathers, in which these early writers merely mention Bishops, seem to imagine, that their point is gained. (Page 126.) They place no such confidence in names. But when they read passages, in which Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons are spoken of, as distinct officers in the Church, separated from the laity, they do then believe Episcopacy to be clearly designated. And really, Sir, how you can reconcile such passages to your doctrine of *parity*, or of *one order* in the ministry, I am unable to conceive. It is true, you say (page 127), "there were *doubtless* Presbyters at that time, as well as now, who, though in full orders, were not invested with a pastoral charge." You mean, then, that the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters was, *the former were invested with pastoral charges, and the latter were not.* Is there any ground for such a distinction in Scripture? Is there a single sentence in the Fathers to countenance it? Or does it ever comport with the Presbyterian form of Church government? The Confession of Faith is now before me, but I find no such distinction. No—It is the ingenious invention of Dr. Miller. These Presbyters, however, in your next sentence, you admit, might have been *ruling Elders.* Ruling Elders are not, among you, ministers. They are lay officers; they are never ordained. Besides, where is the third order, to wit, Deacons? Your Deacons are unordained officers. But there is one plain passage in the Fathers, and it is probably the one you had in view, in which Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons are mentioned as ministers distinct from the laity.

You seem to think that we rely upon the Fathers alone for proof of Episcopacy. Here again you are mistaken. For we connect Scripture with the Fathers.* When we find in Scrip-

* See Preface to the Ordinal.

ture, that during the time of the Apostles, there were three orders, Apostles, Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons, every allusion to, or mention of three orders still, further establishes this fact. We find that all ordinations and confirmations mentioned in Scripture, were performed by the highest order; and we are strengthened in the belief, that this was a divine arrangement in the Church, when there is no instance to the contrary mentioned by the Fathers. We see that Timothy and Titus were vested with the right to ordain and govern Presbyters and Deacons; and we conclude that this was the settled order of the Church, because Timothy and Titus are mentioned by the Fathers as Bishops of the Churches in Crete and Ephesus; as others were Bishops of other Churches. And when the Fathers include Deacons among the ministers of the Church, as distinct from laymen, we infer, that they were, as they are represented in Scripture, regular ministers. The strength of the Episcopal ground lies here, that the Fathers often allude to, and sometimes explicitly mention, *orders* and *arrangements*, that could not have existed, had not Episcopacy been established by the Apostles.

With regard to the early Fathers, it is to be observed, that in hardly any of their writings did they professedly treat of Church polity. And, of course, the same kind of information is to be looked for from them, which we generally find in the sermons and charges of Episcopal clergymen, when the subject of Church government is little agitated. It is also to be observed, that when two orders are mentioned in the ministry, it amounts to no proof, that there were no more; but it is a positive proof that there was that number. It may be of use to keep these observations in mind, during our progress through the Fathers.

You seem always to begin, Sir, with confident assurances to your brethren, that you will destroy the Episcopal claims. I hope I have already made it appear, that these claims sometimes belong entirely to Dr. Miller, and sometimes are but partly Episcopal. You ought to have taken the principles of our Church from her fixed and acknowledged articles and offices; and when you mentioned the claims of individuals, these individuals ought to have been named.

Having premised thus much, I follow you to the venerable *Clemens Romanus*. His Epistle, in my estimation, comes

nearer to Scripture than any of the other writings of the Fathers.

The first passage that you quote I shall consider separately, as it does not refer to the Church of Corinth, but to the Church of Christ in general. "The Apostles, going abroad, preaching through countries and cities, appointed the first fruits of their ministry to be *Bishops* and *Deacons*. Nor was this any thing new; seeing that long before it was written concerning Bishops and Deacons. For thus saith the Scripture in a certain place, 'I will appoint their Bishops in righteousness and their Deacons in faith." This is a description of the Apostolic Church, which exactly coincides with the doctrine of Episcopalians. The Apostles, at first, appointed two more orders, Bishops or Presbyters and Deacons, and thus stood the ministry in their time, Apostles, Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons. But you try, in a note, to evade or confound the plain import of this passage, by saying, "If we interpret Clemens *rigidly*, he will stand an advocate for two orders, instead of three." This cannot be true, unless you exclude the Apostles from the ministry. And as to the passage in Isaiah, if it were a general promise, if even the prophet himself had but a general and indistinct view of the Christian ministry; that is nothing to the purpose; since the ministry, when it was organized, was organized on a *particular* plan. The true character of our Lord himself was but little known from prophecy. I would then ask any man of plain unbiassed understanding, whether, if there had not existed the orders that we contend for, there would have been any propriety or any correctness in what this venerable Bishop has said on the subject? or whether there can be a more clear and decided proof of this nature, that there were more than one order in the ministry in the time of Clemens? He expressly mentions *Apostles*, *Bishops*, and *Deacons*. Indeed, for my part, I do think that if my investigations had been merely for my own satisfaction, I should have stopped at this passage, entirely satisfied: for I consider it as an ample proof that Clemens knew nothing of Presbyterianism.

Your other quotations apply to the peculiar situation of the Corinthian Church at the time when they were written. "The Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ, that contentions

would arise about the name of *Episcopacy;* and, therefore, having a perfect fore-knowledge of this, they appointed persons, as we have before said; and gave direction how, when they should die, other chosen and approved men should succeed in their ministry. Wherefore we cannot think that those may be justly thrown out of their ministry, who were either appointed by them, or afterwards chosen by other eminent men, with the consent of the whole Church. For it would be no small sin in us, should we cast off those from their *Episcopate* (or Bishoprick) who holily and without blame fulfil the duties of it. Blessed are those *Presbyters* who, having finished their course, before these times, have obtained a perfect and fruitful dissolution. For they have no fear lest any one should turn them out of the place which is now appointed for them." And a little afterwards—"It is a shame, my beloved, yea, a very great shame, and unworthy of your Christian profession, to hear, that the most firm and ancient Church of the Corinthians, should, by one or two persons, be led into a sedition against its *Presbyters.* Only let the flock of Christ be in peace with the *Presbyters* that are set over it. He that shall do this, shall get to himself a very great honour in the Lord. Do ye, therefore, who first laid the foundation of this sedition, submit yourselves to your *Presbyters;* and be instructed into repentance, bending the knee of your hearts." The only order here mentioned is Presbyters. The object of the Epistle was to repress a schismatic spirit that had risen in that Church, produced considerable disorder, and ejected some of the Presbyters improperly. It appears there was then no Bishop in Corinth, whose authority might have been exercised to suppress such irregularities. But because a particular Church had then no Bishops, is it to be inferred that other Churches were in the same situation? Or does Clemens tell us that the Presbyters of Corinth performed ordination, or confirmation, or any of the Episcopal offices? No such thing. Nor does it follow that because there was no Bishop in that city, the most prudent advice that Clemens could have given, would have been to appoint one. The same schismatic spirit that had produced the evil complained of, might have shown itself in the appointment of a Bishop.

The allusion to the Jewish priesthood I shall pass by, although

it appears not to be without some importance in such an investigation. It is surely not one of those passages which strengthen the Presbyterian side.

The visions of *Hermas* are of a very peculiar nature, and still they will be read with approbation and advantage by well disposed persons. Consequently we find them held in estimation by learned and pious men, both among the ancients and moderns. There are but few allusions in them to the ministry; and these are much dispersed. The first that you have adduced I shall omit, as being of no value in the present inquiry. The second stands thus: "After this I saw a vision at home, in my own house; and the old woman, whom I had seen before, came to me, and asked me, whether I had yet delivered her book to the *Elders*. And I answered, that I had not yet. She replied, Thou hast done well; for I have certain words more to tell thee. And when I have finished all the words, they shall be clearly understood by the elect. And thou shalt write two books, and send one to *Clement*, and one to *Grapte*. For *Clement* shall send it to the foreign cities, because it is permitted to him to do so. But *Grapte* shall admonish the widows and orphans. But thou shalt read it to the Elders, that are over the Church."* Here we have Clemens mentioned as distinct from all other ministers, and a duty assigned him, which corresponds with the pre-eminence of a *Bishop*. "Clemens shall send it to the foreign cities." Grapte would appear to have been a *Deacon*, for the Deacons had charge of the widows and orphans; and he is not ranked with the *Elders*. I can see nothing here, then, but the clearest designation of an Episcopal ministry.

I shall now pass on to your last quotation, as I find that it and the one already cited, are the only ones you have used in your comment. "For what concerns the tenth mountain, in which were the trees covering the cattle, they are such as have believed, and some of them have been Bishops, that is, governors of Churches.—Others, are such stones, as have not feignedly, but with a cheerful mind, entertained the servants of God. Then such as have been set over inferior ministries, and have protected the poor and the widows."† Here again we have

* Wake's Translation. † Wake's Translation.

three descriptions of ministers, with the plainest allusions to their various departments in the Church of Christ. But you have left out the middle description, for what reason is best known to yourself.

The only argument that you draw from this Father, arises from the use of the term *president* and *to preside.* Now this indeed would be the weakest argument imaginable, were there no illustrations, or limitations to destroy it. Presbyters *preside* over their various Churches, among Episcopalians, in subordination to their Bishop. And here, while the Elders are said to preside over the Church, Clemens is clearly designated as their Bishop. While Bishops are called presidents or governors, two other orders are pointed out at the same time.

It is readily admitted, that *Polycarp* mentions only Presbyters and Deacons, in his epistle to the Church at Philippi. It is a notorious fact, well attested by ecclesiastical history, that there was then no Bishop in that Church: Yet while he mentioned two orders, he could not have had in view the Presbyterian system; for it embraces only one. He is, therefore, another of the holy Fathers who was unacquainted with this plan of Church polity. Besides, he utters not a syllable inconsistent with Episcopacy. You hear no more of elders ordaining ministers or holding confirmations than you can find in the history of the Episcopal Church in America, before the revolution. Indeed, if some such writer as Dr. Miller should hear, a thousand years hence, that before Bishops were obtained, there were none but Elders in the Episcopal Church of America, for I believe at that period there were few, if any, Deacons, he would, no doubt, strenuously contend that it was Presbyterian.

You admit that *Polycarp* is spoken of by several early writers, as Bishop of Smyrna, and also *Clemens*, as Bishop of Rome, and *Ignatius*, as Bishop of Antioch. But you say "they were *pastors*, or among the *pastors*, of particular congregations." Now, in the first place, these Churches are represented as having a number of Presbyters, with only one Bishop. This surely implies some kind of distinction. And there is not the slightest intimation, that this distinction was founded upon superior piety or learning, but that it was purely ministerial. "*Polycarp and the Presbyters that are with him.*" Again, these Bishops are represented as presiding over their churches,

and they are spoken of in the same manner, and with the same marks of superiority, as the Bishops of the same cities, at a time when you acknowledge that Episcopacy prevailed. And further, if complete *parity* existed in the ministry, neither propriety of language, nor a decent respect to the other Presbyters, would have admitted such a term of distinction, or such intimations of superiority, as are clearly to be found in all the early writers. Besides, the ministry in these cities is spoken of as consisting of a single Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons. There is not one solitary circumstance to countenance the belief, that the Presbyters and Deacons were lay-officers, as among you, and the Clergy all Bishops. As to Polycarp's being exhorted, to be *personally* acquainted "*with every member of his flock, to seek out all by name, and not to overlook even the several men and maids of his charge,*" by a contemporary Father; when we come to that Father, we shall find that with your predecessor, Lord King, you have fallen into a great mistake.

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

The Desire of the Christian for the Joys of Heaven.

[Concluded from page 388.]

THE earnest desire of the Christian for the felicity of heaven arises also from the consideration, that there he will be blessed with the consummation of all his joys.

If the prospect of bliss, boundless and exalted as the nature of that God from whom it flows, can excite desire, the Christian must pant for his heavenly inheritance with the most lively ardour. Inconceivable and everlasting glories will there be superadded to the consummation of all the pure and virtuous pleasures of the present existence. Imperfection alloys not only all sublunary virtues and enjoyments, but even those blissful hopes that derive their origin from heaven. In vain does the Christian, while he sojourns in this imperfect state, seek for full and uninterrupted bliss. The infirmity of nature will

often suggest perplexing and desponding fears, that damp the ardour of his joys. Unholy thoughts and affections will at times invade his heart, and alloy the delights of communion with his God. Even in the moments of most holy and intimate intercourse with the Father of his spirit, the infirmities of a mortal nature tie him down to earth, and prevent him from receiving the full fruition of divine pleasures. In the presence of God only, where there is fulness of joy, where there are pleasures for evermore, must he look for the consummation of those spiritual joys of which on earth he receives but an imperfect and partial fruition. The most exalted joys of the saints here below bear no comparison to the bliss which the divine glory sheds on the blest in heaven. Think, O Christian! of thy most pure and happy moments; when thy faith was most elevated; thy love and trust most ardent; when with the most tender and holy fervour thou didst pour out thy soul before God, and experience the rich and enlivening joys of confidence in his mercy. Ah! feeble even these pleasures, compared with the felicity which the glory of God diffuses through the ranks of redeemed spirits. His presence is the fountain of life and bliss. For the fruition of it, let thy most ardent desires be awakened! —" When shall I come and appear before God!" When shall my soul enter on the possession of those immortal joys, which neither sorrow nor sin contaminate! When shall my spirit, soaring above the faint beams which reach this vale of sorrow, derive celestial joys from the throne of divine glory!

Redemption from sin and sorrow, perfection in virtue and bliss, are the glorious blessings of the heavenly state. Behold in them the motives that should excite the Christian earnestly to desire a translation to the presence of God, to the glories of the Church triumphant. Do calamity and sorrow here penetrate the heart, and blast its joys? In the presence of God, sorrow and sighing are done away. Notwithstanding the earnest desires and vigorous exertions of the Christian, has he to lament the feeble advances which he makes towards perfection in virtue? In the presence of God he shall attain that divine purity, that perfect conformity to the divine image, at which he now in vain aims. Does imperfection alloy all his virtuous enjoyments upon earth? Translated to the heavenly state, he shall be satisfied with the plenteous-

ness of God's house, and drink, as out of a river, of his unfailing pleasures. What are the worldly joys then that should check the aspirations of the soul after heaven? What are the considerations that should prevent him who has chosen God for his portion from earnestly desiring the fruition of the glories of the divine presence? Shall sensual pursuits and pleasures, for which the holy soul should have no relish, bound with a perishing world its immortal powers? In proportion as a solicitude for worldly pleasures, as an attention to even the lawful and necessary pursuits of the present life absorb the thoughts and feelings, and withdraw them from the secret and ardent contemplation of heavenly joys, has the Christian reason to apprehend that his faith, his love, his devotion to God are but feeble virtues. The Gospel indeed does not sanction the murmurs of impious discontent with our present condition, nor enjoin that refined mystical communion with the heavenly world, which renders a Christian indisposed to descend to the discharge of the necessary duties of life. Religion does not approve that impatience for celestial joys, which renders the heart insensible to the blessings which a bountiful providence pours forth to cheer the darkness of this imperfect state. No! that holy desire for the perfection and bliss of heaven, which is an important characteristic of the true Christian, will repress those discontented murmers which would render him unworthy of the divine favour; it will excite him to greater zeal and faithfulness in the discharge of those relative and social duties which are made the indispensable price of future bliss; it will heighten those virtuous enjoyments which he expects to perpetuate, in more exalted fruition, in his eternal home. But, what are the considerations that repress the desire of the Christian for the participation of heavenly joys? Does he lament the dependents, the friends, the relatives, whom he leaves contending with the world? He leaves them under the protection and power of an Almighty and unfailing friend. Does he shrink from a separation from those whom long and ardent affection hath seated in his heart? Rather let him contemplate with holy joy the time when the objects of his Christian love shall be united with him in the eternal possession of those glories on which he enters before them! Does the conflict that he anticipates with the king of terrors make him turn with fear-

ful apprehension from the stroke that is to sever him from the world? There is indeed something, in the idea of dissolution, most terrible to nature. To have the frame wrought into agony by the embrace of death; to have the immortal spirit wrested from her earthly tenement; to have the breath of life escaping in convulsive sighs from that body which is soon to become a mouldering and corrupt mass—these are ideas which nature cannot contemplate without emotions of terror. But, Christian believer! these emotions faith will enable thee to overcome. Fix firm thy faith on the grace and mercy of thy Saviour, on the glories of his eternal kingdom; and though thy passage to them must be through the agonies and terrors of death, triumphant faith will still inspire thee with the ardent aspiration, "When shall I come and appear before God?"

Christians! look impartially into your hearts. Are they conformed to the image of God? Is the prevailing bent of your affections to his service? Amidst all the infirmities and doubts that may oppress you, is it your uniform resolution to serve your God, to take up the cross and follow your Redeemer? If this be your character; yours is the inestimable privilege earnestly to pant for those immortal glories, to which, through the grace of the Saviour, you can lay a sure claim. Let no weakness, no distrust, no pressure of worldly care extinguish those ardent desires for the fruition of God's presence, which will cheer the darkest hour of adversity, and shed the radiance of heavenly glory on this vale of tears.

The Happiness of Souls delivered from their earthly Prisons.

(From Dean Stanhope's Meditations of St. Augustine.)

AND happy sure beyond imagination is that blest soul, which making its escape out of this earthly prison, wings its way to heaven without any restraint; which sees its dearest Lord face to face, and no longer enslaved to the fear of death, triumphs in the enjoyments of everlasting glory; possessing thee, O God, the object of its love and long pursuit, and singing hymns of never ceasing praise to the honour of her King and Redeemer;

satiated with the plenteousness of thy house, and drunk with rivers of thy ever-flowing pleasures. O happy company of the heavenly citizens! O glorious pomp of souls returning from their toilsome pilgrimage to the excellence of the beauty, and splendour, and majesty of thy courts! O the ravishing entertainment of those harmonious hymns, the melody of angels, and sweet notes of songs in consort, of which every member of the heavenly choirs bears his part! No mixture of bitter pollutes these holy joys; no malice or wickedness, no want or disgrace, no railing or reviling, or angry disputes, no fear or disquiet, no doubt or uneasiness, or mutual distrust, no force or discord; but perfect peace and love, eternal praise and thanksgiving, uninterrupted rest, and joy everlasting in the Holy Ghost. My God, how happy should I be to hear that transporting music, and those divine compositions, which publish the mysteries and glories of the blessed Trinity! My God, how much happier and more honoured, if admitted not only to hear, but myself to join in consort with those sons of God, who sing to their Christ and King one of the pleasant songs of *Sion!*

O life, truly worthy that name; because everlasting, ever blessed! A life of joy unpolluted with sufferings or sorrow, rest without labour or disturbance, honour without fear or envy, riches without robbery or loss, health without decay, plenty without lack, happiness without disasters—where all good things are enjoyed in perfect charity—where God is seen face to face, and the mind is feasted and fully satisfied with knowledge, ever seeing and ever desiring to see more, but desiring without uneasiness, and satisfied so as never to be cloyed—where the sun of righteousness sheds the refreshing beams of his excellent beauty upon every head; and the original light is so diffused that every inhabitant of those blissful regions shines by the reflection; for being constantly united to the Deity, they are transformed into the likeness of the divine immortality and perfections; thus receiving the full effect of their Holy Lord's promise, *Father, I will that they whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold the glory which thou hast given me, and all be one in us, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.*

O glorious kingdom, to the inheritance whereof we are ad-

vanced, without the melancholy forms of death and succession, and whose possession knows no change or end; but one perpetual day, subject to no revolution of time; and never fading laurels upon the head of each triumphant soldier, who hath fought manfully, and weathered all the toil and hardships of this spiritual warfare! How do I long for that most blessed time, when this poor unworthy creature, the last and least of all my Master's servants, shall be called upon to put off this load of sin and corruption; and thus disburdened, remove, and fix my habitation in the heavenly city, mingling with that harmonious host above, and doing homage with them in the blessed presence of my glorious Lord: Released not only from the sense, but even the sorrowful remembrances of death and suffering, ignorance and infirmity, diseases and temptations, decays and pains, false pleasures, and violent passions, which are our constant exercise and misery, while we continue our journey through this valley of tears.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

[*A desire to contract as much as possible the following Letter, has led to the omission of some passages of the original, as intended for publication in the Monthly Anthology.*]

Letter to the Editor of the Monthly Anthology, containing Remarks on a Review of Dr. MILLER's *Letters on the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry, which appeared in that Work.*

(Concluded from page 395.)

I SHALL further encroach upon you, Mr. Editor, only while I correct some mistakes or misrepresentations of the Reviewer. With great formality he states that "it is very generally agreed, except by a *few* of the most pertinacious of Episcopal and Presbyterian ecclesiastics, that neither our Saviour nor his Apostles have left on record any draught of Church government to be implicitly adopted in subsequent ages as an unalterable model." The Reviewer is evidently ignorant that

this position which he ascribes to high Churchmen, is disclaimed by them. They maintain, indeed, that *Episcopacy*, that *Bishops*, *Priests*, *and Deacons*, are of divine appointment and permanent obligation. Applying the term Church government in this *restricted* sense, they sometimes contend that it is divine and unalterable; but in the usual, more extensive and popular acceptation of the term, by which it is made to include *all* the officers, discipline, rites, ceremonies, and usages of the Church, even "the most pertinacious of Episcopal ecclesiastics" contend that there is no draught of Church government prescribed as an unalterable model. The principle of Churchmen is, that the Church, while she preserves inviolate the orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with their appropriate powers, has a right to institute other officers, and to enjoin rites and ceremonies not prescribed by the word of God; provided all things be done to edification. On this principle does the Church of England and the Episcopal Church in America justify many of their institutions and ceremonies. This is the principle defended by Hooker in his Ecclesiastical Polity, and avowed by all, even "the most pertinacious of Episcopal ecclesiastics."

Again—The Reviewer either mistakes or misrepresents—"The principal Prelate in New-England was consecrated only by the extra-regular and non-juring Bishops of Scotland." "Extra-regular-Bishops of Scotland!" What! is the Reviewer *ignorant* that the non-juring Bishops received Episcopal ordination; or does he mean *wilfully* to insinuate that they were not Episcopally ordained? Is the Reviewer ignorant that Episcopal consecration alone is essential to Episcopal authority; or does he mean to attribute to Episcopalians the Erastian notion, that the *state* can make or unmake Bishops? He certainly ought to know that the non-juring Bishops, by whose successors Bishop Seabury was ordained, lost at the revolution only their temporal power, and still remained true, regular and valid Bishops. What should we think of a man who would maintain that the Bishops of England would forfeit their spiritual authority, and deserve the appellation of extra-regular, should a revolution in that country strip them of their adventitious temporal power, and reduce them in external circumstances to the state of primitive Bishops discountenanced or persecuted by the state?

Again—" The last time this subject employed the pens and passions of the American Clergy was, we believe, in the controversy between the Drs. Chauncy and Chandler."—" Since that time the subject has been wisely suffered to sleep," &c. Is the Reviewer a " Master" in New-England, and has he never heard of the famous election sermon of President Stiles, of Yale College? Has he never heard of the answers to this sermon by Dr. Bowden, now Professor in Columbia College; in which Dr. Chauncy, in that " indigenous work which erudition enriches," is proved to have misquoted and misrepresented the Fathers, and only partially exhibited their testimonies? Let the Reviewer peruse these productions of Dr. Bowden, and he will hesitate before he asserts, that Dr. Chauncy has " exhibited a complete collection of all the passages in the Fathers which can be supposed to relate to the subject of ecclesiastical establishment."

" The most able advocates for Episcopacy," the Reviewer asserts, " have at different times given up every argument from Scripture." This is an extraordinary assertion indeed! What a set of fools or of knaves are these advocates of Episcopacy? They are earnest and persevering in maintaining the divine institution of their hierarchy, and yet they give up every argument from Scripture!!

" The Epistles of Ignatius," according to the Reviewer, are not worth " the immense learning" which has been bestowed upon them. What! the Epistles of a venerable martyr, which abound with pious and holy exhortation, which are used to establish the sacred canon, which bear testimony to the *divinity* of Jesus, not worthy of being proved genuine! " Till it can be clearly shown what portions of them are authentic, the anti-Episcopalians may refuse their authority." Let the Reviewer expunge from these Epistles all the passages which establish Episcopacy, and then let him endeavour to ascertain the sense and connection!

The Reviewer refers to two passages in *Jerome*, which, he asserts, " all the ingenuity of the mitre has never yet been able to evade or invalidate." There is not an *advocate of the mitre*, however obscure or humble, who cannot produce innumerable passages from Jerome which unequivocally assert the Apostolic institution of Bishops; and who cannot justly contend that these

two disputed passages, if the consistency of Jerome is to be preserved, ought not to be construed so as to militate against his other declarations. At any rate, there is not an advocate of the mitre who will not reasonably conclude, that the anti-Episcopal cause must be hard pressed indeed, when it clings for support to a Father who lived near the close of the fourth century.

On the subject of this boasted testimony of JEROME, the Episcopalian can produce an unexceptionable authority. Against STILLINGFLEET Dr. *Miller* cannot object; for he has availed himself largely of the *Irenicum*, a work written by Stillingfleet, as he acknowledges,* in "his younger days," and for the "errors and mistakes" of which he pleads "the scepticalness and injudiciousness of youth, and the prejudices of education." Against the authority of Stillingfleet the *Reviewer* cannot object; for he joins with Dr. Miller in considering Stillingfleet as maintaining Episcopacy only on the ground of "human expediency," &c. Let us hear then what *Stillingfleet* says of these passages of Jerome, which, according to the Reviewer, are "unequivocal," and in favour of which he quotes an author (Gibbon) who certainly was very willing that his readers should believe that Christianity, and the Church, and its priesthood, were all "human institutions," "*encroachments*" on the natural rights of mankind. Stillingfleet says,† "If Jerome be understood of the setting up of Episcopacy in the Apostolic churches *after* the *Apostles' times*, and a trial then made of governing by Presbyters, he cannot be excused from contradicting himself as well as the rest of the Fathers. For what experiment was there of that kind in the *Church of Alexandria*, if *from* St. MARK's *time* the Presbyters set *up one above themselves, as an army making choice of a general;* which are his own expressions? Will any man say, an army is governed by a council of inferior officers, when they have a general over them, though of their own choosing? So in *the Church of Jerusalem*, he saith, *St. James was the first Bishop:* How was that Church then governed by a council of Presbyters? At *Ephesus*, he confesses, *Timothy* was Bishop there, and *Titus* in *Cretc*. At

* Epistle Dedicatory to his ordination Sermon at St. Paul's.
† Ordination at St. Paul's.

Rome, he makes *Linus* and *Clemens* to *succeed in the Bishopric there.* At *Antioch*, he says, *Ignatius was Bishop;* and he owns his *Epistles*, and surely there is nothing like the sole government by Presbyters in them. At *Smyrna*, he saith, *Polycarp was appointed Bishop, and had care of the Churches of Ana.* Where then, according to St. Jerome, is this *government by Presbyters* to be found after the Apostles' times?" "St. Jerome makes this government *(Episcopacy)* in the very same places to bear an analogy to *Aaron and his sons and the Levites in the temple, to Moses and the seventy Elders under the law;* and in other places out of the heat of dispute, when the Roman Deacons were not in his head, he makes the *Bishops the successors of the Apostles.* But if they had come in by usurpation, he could have called them the successors of *Simon Magus*, of *Diotrephes*, of *Caiaphas*, and according to his warm manner of expression, of *Lucifer* himself."

The fact also mentioned by EUTYCHIUS, the Reviewer asserts, "is hardly less important, and deserves something more than bare quotation in a note," where Dr. Miller has placed him. I suspect Dr. Miller knew "something more" than the Reviewer. He knew that Eutychius was a patriarch of the tenth century; that therefore, considering the period in which he lived, he could be of no authority, even were he not convicted of notorious credulity and mistakes. Dr. Miller acted wisely, therefore, in placing Eutychius in a note, and he would have acted more wisely had he said nothing about him.

The Reviewer passes many high encomiums on Dr. Miller's work. These encomiums are sometimes a little qualified; and they would probably have been less decided had not Dr. Miller, in his zeal to demolish Episcopacy, often deserted the Presbyterian model, and appeared the advocate of the Congregational form. How far his work will increase his fame as a man of learning and candour, and a sound reasoner, the public will soon have an opportunity of judging.* Indeed, had it been

* Since this letter was written two replies to Dr. Miller's Letters have appeared: to wit, "Letters addressed to the Rev. *Samuel Miller*, D. D. in Reply to his Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry. In which there is an humble Attempt to show that the charges against the Episcopal Church and her Advocates, are totally unfounded; and in which the preliminary Reasoning of the Reverend Author is particularly considered. Being introductory to an Examination of the whole Work. By

Dr. Miller's "plan to quote his authorities," he might not only, as the Reviewer states, have quoted "Chauncy instar omnium," but King, Stillingfleet, Boyse, and Campbell, of all whom Dr. Miller has liberally availed himself.

It is much to be lamented that in these letters Dr. Miller condescends to urge against Episcopalians the vulgar charge of *bigotry*. He exhorts his people "to bear with bigots, to forgive their uncharitableness, and to pity their *delusion*."* Dr. Miller ought to know that this charge applies to individuals whose hearts assure them that they are strangers to that contracted, censorious, and vindictive spirit in which the essence of bigotry exists, and which render the bigot the object of odium and scorn. To many passages of Dr. Miller's book may be justly applied the language of the psalmist—"His words were smoother than oil, and yet they be very swords."

The Reviewer throughout his remarks reprobates the discussion of the question of ecclesiastical order in this country. But why is this discussion improper? The constitution of the Christian Ministry is allowed on all hands to be a subject of great importance. Dr. Miller acknowledges that "the mode of the organization of the Church cannot be a trivial concern; and if the Saviour, or those who were immediately taught by his Spirit, have laid down any rules, or given us any information on this subject, it behoves us carefully to study what they have delivered, and to make it our constant guide."† To ascertain whether Christ and his Apostles constituted particular officers in the Church, and a particular mode of commissioning these officers—and who are these officers, and what is this mode—is an object which may well employ the consideration of every Christian who wishes to know and to do the will of his heavenly Master. Why then should discussions be reprobated which afford the Christian the means of information? Is not this country particularly the proper place for such discussions? For what is there among us to bias or to restrain free inquiry? Here no denominations by the laws of the land can have any

Thomas Y. How."—"The Apostolic Origin of Episcopacy asserted, in a Series of Letters addressed to the Rev. Dr. *Miller*, one of the Pastors of the United Presbyterian Churches in the City of New-York. By the Rev. *John Bowden*, D. D. Professor of Moral Philosophy, Logic, and Belles Letters, in Columbia College.—*Audi alteram partem*."

* Miller's Letters, p. 19 and 351. † Miller's Letters, p. 6.

influence but what their claims to greater Apostolic purity can give them. With all true Christians the inquiry will be, not merely what ministry is most *expedient;* but what is constituted on the *Apostolic* model. In religious matters, Christians have learnt to call only one their master, even Christ. And if it has pleased the divine Head of the Church to organize its ministry on a peculiar model, are those who are anxious to ascertain and to contend for this model to be accused of an "uncharitable and encroaching spirit?" These accusations are unworthy of the scholar, the gentleman, and the Christian. Human nature is, in many respects, the same under every change of circumstance; and unhappily, instances of abuse of power have been as frequent among the Independents, who resisted all power but of their own making, as among those who masked their love of dominion under the humble attire of "the Scotch bonnet," or presented the more attractive splendour of the "mitre" or the "tiara." But why must Episcopalians be accused of "encroaching?" Is it more unpardonable in them to contend for the exclusive claim of their ministry to Apostolic institution, than for Dr. Miller to claim for his "the honour of being the only primitive model?" Let then these recriminations, these popular arts of rendering individuals and their opinions odious, be renounced. There will be no danger that ill-will or animosity will be excited by these discussions. They are not by any means to be reprobated, or even to "be regarded as useless. When conducted with the meekness and benevolence of the Gospel, they are productive of various substantial benefits."* Not only will a spirit of inquiry be roused, and not only will the love of literature diffuse its dignified spirit among the Clergy; but what is of more consequence, Christians will become acquainted with the only true bond of visible communion, a ministry transmitted from Christ and his Apostles. Zion, now distracted and divided, will shine forth in primitive lustre, at unity with herself, and the joy of the whole earth.

* Dr. Miller's Letters, p. 21.

CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

WE solicit the indulgence of our readers to the following remarks, assuring them that it is with reluctance we notice the Christian's Magazine in our pages. Our apology is, that the last number contains a serious mistatement of the conduct of a respectable Episcopal clergyman, and a charge of *gross* errors in *matters of fact*, against the Editor of this work, as the author of the "Apology for Apostolic Order." A regard to reputation and to truth require that this charge and mistatement should be immediately noticed.

The following is an extract from the last number of the Christian's Magazine, page 361, &c.

"In the fall of 1806, a young gentleman, extremely attached to the Episcopal Church, and an advocate for the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, was led, by mere curiosity, to a weekly evening lecture in one of the neighbouring non-Episcopal Churches. The subject, which was our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus on the new birth, arrested his attention, and the argument went home to his heart. He became convinced that he had been in fatal error as to the ground of his eternal hope; an entire revolution was wrought in his sentiments and character; and, at length, under more sound and evangelical views, he applied to the minister whose labours had been blessed to him, for admission to the Lord's table. After giving a satisfactory account of his Christianity, he was desired to ask from his Episcopal pastor a certificate of dismission: his friend at the same time remarked, 'Although he does not acknowledge me to be a lawful minister of the Gospel, yet I deem it proper to pay him this compliment.' The certificate was asked; but, instead of giving it, the Episcopal clergyman broke out into an invective against the youth; told him 'he deserved to be excommunicated—that he was *leaving the way of salvation*—that Jesus Christ would reject him at the great day—and that he,' the clergyman, 'would be witness against him!!'

"The reader may rely upon the fact. We have place, names, and authority to give, should it be denied. The cler-

gyman is well known; and has distinguished himself as an advocate of 'the Church;' and, with all deference to Dr. H. *his* construction of her claims appears to us to be not unlike 'Episcopacy or perdition!"

We make no remark on the pointed insinuation in the above extract, that those Episcopalians who advocate the scriptural and primitive doctrine of *baptismal regeneration* are strangers to that *renewing of the mind* which is essential to man's acceptance with God; and are "in fatal error as to the ground of their eternal hope." We are so accustomed to such evidences of the humility, meekness, and candour of these exclusive pretenders to the Holy Spirit's influences, and to "sound and evangelical views," that insinuations of this kind cease to astonish us. And we have perused enough from the pen of the Editor of the Christian's Magazine, to prevent us from being surprised at any exaggeration or disingenuousness that may contribute to *crush* his antagonist. The moment we perused the extract above given, we pronounced it a *mistatement.* And so it turns out to be. We immediately forwarded a copy of the extract to the Episcopal minister who is so pointedly referred to, that we could be at no loss to find him out. And we request the attention of our readers to the following reply from one who is equally incapable of wilful mistatement, and of the ungenerous arts of exaggeration to destroy the reputation of an opponent.*

"I have read with due attention the extract you have sent me from the Christian's Magazine. With you I think it probable that the author of that piece has made an attempt to represent a transaction which took place between a young man who formerly belonged to my congregation and myself. To this conclusion I am led by the leading circumstances of the case reported; for, otherwise, the facts are so egregiously discoloured, and many of the particulars mentioned so utterly false, that I should be disposed to question whether it has any reference to myself. I shall now give you a brief statement of the matter with as much accuracy as my memory will permit

* It may not be amiss to apprize our readers that we have received from Dr. Mason the name of the Episcopal minister to whom he referred. He is the person whom we addressed on the subject, and from whom we received the reply now communicated.

at this distance of time from the event alluded to. It is impossible that I should recollect every expression which was used in conversation with the young man in question on that occasion, but as to every thing important in this affair, I pledge my veracity for the correctness of the following narrative.

"It is true that a young man belonging originally to the Lutheran Church, from some cause or other, I believe he once told me, from a preference of our forms of worship, connected himself with mine, and became one of the most regular attendants on public worship amongst us. But a short time had elapsed after my settlement in this place before he made application to me to be received into full communion. As I had before remarked in him a regular attention to the duties of religion, and a seriousness and sobriety of private conduct uncommon at his age, after a slight examination, being convinced of his fitness, I gave him admission to the holy table. From this time he became one of my most regular and devout communicants. Very much pleased with seeing a man at so early an age devote himself to the service of God with such zeal and assiduity, I became every day more and more interested with him. I had recourse to every expedient I could devise to promote his moral and religious improvement, of which he seemed very desirous. I lent him such books to read as I thought at the same time that they would make him acquainted with the doctrine, discipline, and form of worship of his own Church, would cultivate also his pious sentiments, and animate him in the good course on which he had entered. Whilst matters were thus progressing as I imagined—whilst I was taking unusual pains to contribute to his instruction—before he had given me any intimation of a change in his opinions, he announces to me his intention of abandoning the communion of our Church, and connecting himself with that of another denomination of Christians. It is true that I felt on this occasion all that solicitude which a pastor should feel for one of his flock when he sees him tearing himself from the bosom of that Church which he deems to be pre-eminently the true Church of Christ—when he beholds him wandering from that way which he believes to be the most sure and certain way of salvation. It is true that I felt the mingled emotions of tenderness and resentment not unlike those which a parent feels for his

child that is taking a step which he deems dangerous and criminal—It is true, that animated by these sentiments, I spoke to him with an earnestness and warmth which he may have misconstrued into anger. And surely I shall be excused for having been excited to some warmth when I thus saw, plucked from me by a delusion which, deeply as I deplored it, I was unable to dispel, a lamb which I had nurtured, as it were, in my own bosom, and which I expected one day to present to my Lord as a crown of my rejoicing, and as a pledge that I had not been totally useless in his service. It is not true, however, that I "broke out into an invective against the youth," that I told him "he deserved to be excommunicated—that he was leaving the way of salvation—that Jesus Christ would reject him on the great day—and that I, the clergyman, would be a witness against him." All these things, as asserted in the Christian's Magazine, are *absolutely false.* I considered it, indeed, a solemn duty to urge upon him every consideration which was consistent with truth, to prevent him from taking a step which I deemed so extremely reprehensible. I apprised him of the strong obligations we were under, if there be a true Church of Christ on earth, to continue in her bosom—of the awful danger and guilt of separating from her communion. I cautioned him to examine well his own heart, and see that no improper motive mingled itself with those that influenced his conduct, in as much as for this as for every other act of his life he was accountable to God; and, moreover, that I entertained no doubt but that schism, when not justified by the most cogent reasons, would be considered, on the last day, as a most heinous sin, and punished accordingly. I reproved him for not having before given me notice of his intention, that if he laboured under any difficulties or doubts in regard to his salvation, I might have removed them. I remarked, that if he was now conscious that he had not hitherto been renewed in heart by the spirit of God, (or regenerated as the new master, at whose feet he had imbibed his strange doctrine, would choose to call it) he might become so, as well in his own Church as in any other. In short, to conclude the statement of this matter, when I had driven him from every ground he had taken, he remarked, that he thought he could receive more spiritual comfort in the non-Episcopal Church, and he had resolved to enter

into it. Thus ended our conference.—I refused to give him a certificate of dismission, because, considering the circumstances of the case, I thought it indelicate in the minister of the other denomination to request it; and more especially because the Church cannot surely be expected to bestow her benediction on one of her members, when he is in the very act of committing a sin which subjects him to her severest censure."

Now, let the reader pause—let him peruse the extract from the Christian's Magazine—let him peruse the above statement—let him make the case his own; and we need not supply him with epithets by which to express his sense of the conduct of the Editor of the Christian's Magazine.

The course which the Episcopal pastor pursued was perfectly correct. It was his duty to guard this member of his flock from the danger of "perishing in the gainsaying of Corah;" to warn him of the guilt of that sin of "schism," which divine inspiration enumerates among the "carnal" sins, and from which he had often prayed in the Litany of the Church which he was forsaking, to be delivered. The warning was given, not in the *exceptionable language* which the Editor of the Christian's Magazine imputes to the Episcopal pastor, but, as was natural and proper, in a style of earnest yet affectionate remonstrance.

In a case of this kind, what would have been the dictates of *discretion*, *justice*, and *Christian charity?* Christian *charity* would have suggested that, possibly this "young gentleman" had misunderstood his Episcopal pastor, or had undesignedly exaggerated his remarks; that possibly the non-Episcopal minister whose "labours had been thus blessed," (who, by the way, gives no evidence of his prudence or his conciliation, in whetting Dr. M.'s wrath against Episcopalians) that possibly the non-Episcopal minister, in the warmth of his feelings at having his commission called in question, was not altogether an impartial historian of the case; and had probably not lightened the shades of the colouring. *Discretion*, as well as charity, would have dictated some examination before the highly wrought picture, in which the Episcopal pastor was to be so prominent and odious a figure, was laid before the public. *Justice* would have dictated an inquiry from the Episcopal pastor concerning the

truth of this *exparte* statement; would have permitted him to be heard before he was condemned. But no; there was no inquiry, no examination, no hearing. The story just suited the purpose. It is placed in the Christian's Magazine, retouched indeed by the soft and delicate pencil of the Editor! Reader, are you astonished at this conduct? It is more than we are. We recollect that this is not the first time that the Christian's Magazine has vouched for a "fact," which we proved to be, in the only material point for which it was introduced, without foundation.* And yet this is the gentleman who is perpetually accusing Dr. H. of "being fervid, impetuous, and unceremonious."

But surely this story comes with a very bad grace from the Editor of the Christian's Magazine. We will suppose a case. It is not an impossible one. Suppose a member in full communion with the *Associate Reformed Church* should apply to one of its pastors, who shall be nameless, for a certificate of dismission; and should state as a reason, that he wished to join the Episcopal Church, where he should be certain of enjoying those valid ministrations which he was doubtful whether he enjoyed in his present connection. Reader, do you not envy his situation? How cheering the smile that would illumine the countenance of the evangelical pastor! How harmonious the accents that would flow from his lips!

The author of the Apology is accused† of "gross errors in matters of fact;" and, as usual, the pretty broad insinuation is given, that there is no confidence to be placed in his representations.

It had been boasted by the Editor of the Christian's Magazine, that "the visible unity of the Church is preserved by Presbyterian regimen, by perfect *equality of rank* among her ministers." To disprove this assertion, the author of the Apology undertook to exhibit an account (which Dr. M. does not venture to say is inaccurate) of the various *divisions* among Presbyterians. He also stated the *ecclesiastical censures*

* We allude to the statement at p. 92, vol. i. of the Christian's Magazine, of the circumstances attending an ordination sermon by an Episcopal minister, which statement was exposed in p. 47, of the "Apology," &c.

† Christian's Magazine, p. 163.

which those divisions had occasioned.* It was no material consequence to the argument whether those *censures* were *excommunication* or *deposition.* Dr. H.'s point, that Presbyterianism is not productive of *unity*, was proved by the facts which he fully established, that there are various sects among Presbyterians who have inflicted church censures upon each other, and who refuse to each other church fellowship. It is true, the censure inflicted on the seceding ministers was called *deposition;* but that this was considered as virtually an *excommunication* is evident from the language used by them. They give the following account of this sentence in their own standard book,† to which the author of the Apology was principally indebted for the exhibition of the tendency of Presbyterianism to promote the unity of the Church. "Being thus violently *cast out of the Church*," &c. In fact, when we see the various sects of Presbyterians in Scotland and in this country refusing Church fellowship with each other; accusing each other of corruption, apostacy, and schism, and inflicting in some cases ecclesiastical censures, which operated as excommunications, we confess we think our point established, that whatever excellences Presbyterianism may claim, that of *preserving Church unity* is not one.‡

The statement of the author of the Apology is in all important points correct. Had it been more inaccurate than it is in trifling particulars, a dignified antagonist would have disdained to triumph in a victory so insignificant; and a candid disputant, in correcting inaccuracies, would have scorned to avail himself of those which did not materially affect the subject. But what is the conduct of the Editor of the Christian's Magazine? In a former number of his work he selects some incidental remarks of Dr. H. proves some trifling fallacy—and then triumphantly asserts, that the pen of Dr. H. is invariably connected with the "genius of mistake;" while the very work

* Apology for Apostolic Order, p. 221, &c.

† "Narrative and testimony agreed upon and enacted by the General Associate Synod, &c. p. 44. Edinburgh. 1804.

‡ That we have not substantially erred in our accounts of Presbyterianism the reader may be satisfied by perusing the work quoted in the preceding note, and also the "Declaration and testimony of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania," and particularly, "Reformation principles exhibited by the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

which he is criticising proves that, in order to fix the imputation of an "outrage" by the Episcopal Clergy upon their non-Episcopal brethren, he is guilty of a gross mistatement, which he is ashamed to defend, while he cannot summon the magnanimity to retract it.*

In the last number, the following are some of the very *modest* and "*ceremonious*" sentences which grace its pages. "This is an awkward instance of *felo de se;* yet a proof, how properly the Rev. critic has assumed the appellation of *Detector;* for he has completely *detected* himself, and no one else!"—"The *Detector* has given the passage a *twist*, in the hope of *twisting* Jerome out, and *twisting* the hierarchy in."—"But as we wish to give every one his due, we cannot charge the Right Reverend Prelate with any *art;* nor withhold an advice, that when he is searching, on this subject, for a 'spark of modesty,' he would direct his inquiries to a 'bosom' to which he has much easier access, than to the bosom of any Presbyterian under heaven." And yet, reader, the above passages are the quintessence of politeness and moderation compared with those that might be collected from other numbers. But we cannot yet bring ourselves again to submit to the odious drudgery of collecting nauseous weeds from the rank soil of arrogance and vanity. And yet this is the gentleman who is eternally accusing Dr. H. of being "fervid, impetuous, and unceremonious," of "dealing principally in rant, rhapsody, and personal abuse." Truly this is "ceremonious" indeed. Dr. M. makes a violent attack upon Dr. H.—levels against him the artillery of invective, ridicule, and misrepresentation. And when Dr. H. attempts to stand on the defensive, to speak of Dr. M. and his writings as they *deserve*, Dr. M. accuses him of being "fervid, impetuous, and unceremonious." But we stand corrected. All acknowledge that the Christian's Magazine exhibits whatever is humble and amiable, polite and decorous, dignified and candid! It would be a crime to dissent from a judgment so universal!

But how long is it that Dr. M. has startled at the sound of a "noblesse?"† Perhaps there are some who hail this as an

* See note p. 478.

† "Had there never been, in the persons of the prelates, a sort of spiritual *noblesse;* there could never have been, in the person of the Pope, a spiritual

omen that he will before long join the ranks of those who consider not only aspiring *prelates*, but even humble Presbyterian Priests as a hated aristocracy, a privileged order, a *noblesse*, enemies to the rights of mankind. But if to be a "Bishop" necessarily implies the presence of the violent, the ambitious, and overbearing passions, we suspect there are many who will be "unceremonious" enough to insinuate that the name is richly merited by some persons who will never have any legitimate title to it.

Dr. M. is pleased to exercise his forbearance, in not exposing "the sophisms, perversions, mistakes and puerilities" of Dr. H.'s *Apology*. Dr. H. introduced that work with an acknowledgment of its many imperfections, of which he was deeply sensible.* The circumstances under which it was written, he never supposed, would weigh as any apology for its imperfections with Dr. M. But the author of it felt that these circumstances gave him some claim to the indulgence of candid readers. It would be wonderful indeed if there were no imperfections in a work of no inconsiderable length; in which, as Dr. M. has declared,† Dr. H. has "thought proper to retread the whole of the controverted ground,—and in defending her [his church] from the denunciations of the Christian's Magazine, to expatiate at full length upon several material topics which it had not so much as touched." And this work, in which Dr. H. "retreads," Dr. M. himself being judge, "the *whole of the controverted ground*," and "expatiates at *great length* upon several *material* topics," was written in as many weeks as it has taken Dr. M. months to prepare a Magazine

monarch." Christian's Magazine, vol. ii. p. 347.

* "He is doubtful whether he ought to claim any indulgence for the imperfections of this performance, from the peculiar circumstances under which it was written. It was his wish to lay it by for frequent and careful revision. But the violence of the assault upon him seemed to require an immediate defence. He was, therefore, compelled to go rapidly on, amidst constant interruptions, amidst the calls of his usual professional duties, and often under the pressure of bodily languor. He candidly states these circumstances, because deference to the public requires that no immature or incorrect production should, if possible, be exposed to its view. But he is writing idly. The performance wields the weapon of controversy. He concludes, therefore, that it can claim no quarter. He leaves it to its fate. His chief solicitude ought to be, that its imperfections should not injure the cause which it advocates." Preface to Apology for Apostolic Order.

† Christian's Magazine, vol. i. p. 465.

containing not more than 60 or 70 small pages of original matter, and these probably not all to be ascribed to the Editor.

But with all its imperfections, Dr. H. will join issue with Dr. M. in submitting it and the Christian's Magazine to "any competent tribunal, without the aid of counsel." He feels perfectly easy in the assurance, that with all its "mistakes and puerilities," it contains a complete vindication of its author from the charges of Dr. M. and an exposure of the fallacy of his laboured statements and reasonings.

We again beg the indulgence of our readers. We are aware of the tendency of controversy to degenerate into personal altercation. We know there are religious controversialists with

"Peace on their looks and vengeance in their pens."

But the vengeance of the pen is justifiable or censurable as it is prompted by truth and guided by justice, or as it prostrates both in the gratification of personal resentment. Severer language, could not proceed from human lips, than that with which the lowly Saviour of men reprehended a race who have transmitted to the present day that self-sufficient spirit which prompts the arrogant exclamation—"Stand off from me, for I am holier than thou." There is a virulent pride even in religion which can be exposed, and there are offences in literary and theological society which can be punished, only by the pen of truth, and the lash of justice. The unpleasant consequences are to be attributed to the offender, not to him who inflicts the merited chastisement.

To expose that sophistry which perpetually perverts and misrepresents; to chastise that arrogance which would expel from the fields of literature and religion every individual who presumes to doubt the oracular infallibility of its decisions—is a duty demanded by the interests of truth and the rights of conscience; and not, we trust, incompatible with that charity which, enlightened and just, never demands us to spare the crime in compassion for the offender. It is a duty, however, which shall, in due time, be discharged through some other vehicle than the Churchman's Magazine; which we wish to devote to discussions more congenial with our feelings, and we are ready to concede, more interesting, profitable and honourable.

We conclude with calling the attention of our readers to the following forcible remarks from the pen of the Episcopal pastor who has been so ungenerously attacked in the Christian's Magazine.

Speaking of the young man whose conversion from Episcopacy seems to be a subject of boast, he observes:

"The non-Episcopalians have no cause of triumph at this acquisition to their society. The young man, indeed, is a very worthy one, and one who I can avow with sincerity, it is my heart's desire and prayer to God may at last be saved; but he certainly is not of that description of men who are the most difficult to be deluded in matters of this kind. He has no pretention to intellectual force. His opinion, therefore, cannot be considered as affording any presumption of the truth of any doctrine he embraces, or of the strength of that evidence which was adduced in its support. He could not have fabricated a more clumsy apology for leaving the communion of his Church, and conveying a pang to the bosom of an affectionate and good mother, who still deeply regrets this change in her son. If he thought he had not been regenerated according to the new notions he had imbibed, could he not have become so as well in his own Church as out of it? Is not the Spirit of God to be found in as large and operative portions within the pale of the Episcopal Church as of any other? He must or ought to have known that the doctrine of his Church, although it differ verbally, does not differ substantially on this point from that of the denomination of Christians among whom he was entering. They make, indeed, a great outcry against us, because, in the language of scripture and of the early writers of the Church, we denominate baptism regeneration; whilst they confine the term regeneration entirely to signify that effect which is produced upon adults by the Spirit of God when they are brought to a sense of guilt, and when, by the purification of their hearts and the sanctification of their depraved natures, they are rendered meet to be partakers of the kingdom of heaven. But we would beg all non-Episcopalians to let us undeceive them in this particular. We indeed annex a greater efficacy to the sacrament of baptism than they do; but we ascribe no less efficacy to the operation of the Spirit of God upon the

hearts of adults. We believe as well as they, that the operation of this holy Spirit is necessary to work within us to will and to do of the good pleasure of God; and this effect, which is thus operated by divine grace, we term renovation: So that on this point the only difference between us and the non-Episcopalians is, that they denominate that effect which is produced upon the minds of those of mature age by the Spirit of God regeneration, and we term it renovation. On the subject of baptism we differ fundamentally and very essentially from them, and we are prepared to show that our doctrine of baptismal regeneration is the unequivocal language of Scripture and the primitive Church. The very case of the conversation which Christ held with Nicodemus, from which, it seems, the discourse was preached which was so wonderfully blessed, is one which goes as strongly and pointedly in proof of our doctrine as we could have desired. Would our Saviour have said to Nicodemus, "Art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things," had he meant any thing but baptismal regeneration, since this is the only species of regeneration with which a master in Israel could have been supposed to be acquainted? Where could Nicodemus have imbibed the Presbyterian notion of regeneration?

"Again—I beg the reader to observe the terms in which the Editor of the Christian's Magazine, or one of his coadjutors, couches his report of the case in question. 'The subject (on which this young man heard the non-Episcopal clergyman discourse) which was our Saviour's conversation with Nicodemus on the new birth, arrested his attention, and the argument went home to his heart. He became convinced that he had been in fatal error as to the ground of his eternal hope; an entire revolution was wrought in his sentiments and character; and, at length, under more sound and evangelical views, he applied himself to the Minister whose labours had been blessed to him, for admission to the Lord's table.' Look well at this passage, Episcopalians, I entreat you; and ask yourselves, are these the men who raise such a clamour, and indulge themselves in such pompous declamation and bitter invective against those of your Ministers, who, as they pretend, are exclusive in their principles, consider themselves as belonging to the only true Church,

deny the validity of all ordinations administered by those who are not episcopally ordained; and thus present to others, if the Editor of the Christian's Magazine may be believed, no other alternatives but "Episcopacy or perdition!" Look at this passage, I say, and then ask yourselves, if they will ever dare, henceforth, to use the same language. This young man, then, forsooth, while in full communion with the Episcopal Church, was in "*fatal error*, as to the ground of his eternal hope," until by a fortunate accident, he heard a non-Episcopal preacher give his exposition of the conversation which passed between Christ and Nicodemus. All you, of course, Episcopalians, whilst in full communion with your Church; whilst you are indulging the humble, but cheering hope, that you are in the certain way of salvation, are in "fatal error as to the ground of your eternal hope," and must have recourse to a non-Episcopal clergyman for his interpretations of scripture, before you can obtain "sound and evangelical views;" must have "an entire revolution wrought in your sentiments and character," before you are fitted to appear at the table of your Lord, and of course before you are prepared to enter into the kingdom of heaven. This is charity with a witness; a charity altogether worthy of its author, perfectly congenial with that liberal spirit, which pervades the Christian's Magazine. We have heard a great deal about "Episcopacy or perdition;" but if the language of the piece is not Presbyterianism or perdition, then I must yield up all my claims to the power of comprehending the most intelligible speech. Yes—this doctrine as effectually excludes all Episcopalians from salvation, as the doctrine which we maintain excludes all non-Episcopalians from being in the true Church of Christ. It is of no consequence whether the exclusion be found in a matter of external order, or whether it be a matter purely doctrinal.—If Episcopalians are ever saved, it must be by their compliance with all the terms of salvation, prescribed in the Gospel. If they neglect to fulfil any of these conditions; if they are in "any fatal error as to the ground of their eternal hope," their case is a lost one, they must perish. So, then, here is damnation to all Episcopalians—aye! I may say damnation to almost all the Christian world ever since the days of Christ and his Apostles, written in broad and legible characters

in the pages of the Christian's Magazine. For decency's sake let these men never again open their mouths about exclusive pretensions, uncharitable opinions, unchurching other denominations and narrowing the way of salvation, "Episcopacy or perdition," and all that farrago of sophistry and nonsense with which the multitude are made to stare."

MARRIED,

At Norwalk, Connecticut, by the Rev. Mr. Whitlock, Mr. Daniel Nash, jun. to Miss Rebecca Camp, both of Norwalk. —Mr. Andrew Kellogg, of Troy, New-York, to Miss Hannah Hoyt, of New-Canaan, Connecticut.

At Newark, New-Jersey, by the Rev. Mr. Willard, Dr. James Lee, of New-London, to Miss Gertrude Mercer, daughter of the Hon. Archibald Mercer, Esq.—Mr. Peter Reynolds, merchant, to Miss Catharine Kingsland, daughter of Edmund W. Kingsland, Esq.—Mr. Jonathan Sayrs to Mrs. Sarah Canfield.

☞ In future no account of marriages and deaths will be inserted which is not forwarded for publication.

☞ The Editor deems it his duty to express his thanks for the recent accession of patronage to the Magazine. The list of subscribers is, however, small in proportion to the number of Episcopalians who possess the means, and, the Editor also trusts, the inclination to patronize a work devoted to the interests of religious truth, and, in particular, to the explanation and defence of the doctrines and institutions of the Episcopal Church. The Editor indulges the hope, that the Magazine is calculated to advance these important objects; and on this ground, and not on its freedom from defects, does he rest its claim to the increased patronage of the friends of religion and the Church.

INDEX

TO

VOL. V.

	Page.
ANECDOTES	119
Apocryphal book of Enoch	68
Appendix to Observer	76
Calendar, error in	78
Calvinistic and Arminian controversy compared with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans	332, 414
Censorious man	89
Christian's Magazine	473
Church of England defended	59
Churchman's creed	102
Circular letter	235
Comet, remarks on	39
Confession, an act of	269
Deluge, &c.	48
Desire of the Christian for the joys of Heaven	385, 461
Devotion, method of	110
Difficulties in Religion	71
Duty of receiving the Holy Eucharist	395
Ecclesiastical news	158, 235, 318, 319 399
Elucidation of John vi. 37	287, 367
Episcopacy	52
Episcopacy vindicated, in a series of Letters from the Rev. Dr. Kemp to the Rev. Dr. Miller	166, 258, 344, 454
Exposition of Psalm xxiii.	6, 45
——— of Psalm lxvii.	293
Extract from Blair	40
——— on the Liturgy	87
Faith, an act of	272
Fanaticism	118
Forms of Prayer, remarks on	113
Grace, prayer for	271
Homage, trust, and obedience to be rendered to Christ	187
Happiness of souls delivered from their earthly prisons	464
History of the Protestant Episcopal Church	193
House of God the house of Prayer	10, 84
How s Discourse—The Testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy	428
How's Letters, extracts from	133
Le Boo, account of	25
Letter to a young friend, &c.	144
Letter of the Rev. H. Knox on Free-Will, Divine Decrees, &c.	377, 436
Letter to the Editor of the Monthly Anthology	388, 466
Life of Francis Quarles	1
——— Rev. Dr. Ogilvie	41
——— Rev. Dr. Achmuty	81
——— Archbishop Markham	121
——— Bishop Douglass	161
——— William Stephens, Esq.	241
——— Archbishop Potter	321
——— of Bishop Hurd,	401
Liturgy	87, 101
Marriages	158, 319, 400, 486
Methodism, portrait of	66
Meteor, observations on	35
Naaman the Syrian	324
Obituary	79, 120, 158, 320
Prayer by Thomas Aquinas	252
Predestination, remarks on	292
Prospectus of Churchman's Magazine (New Series)	159
Psalmody	141
Psalms, remarks on	105, 153
Psalms and Anthems, thoughts on the singing of	175
Puritans, history of their intrigues, &c. against the Church of England	64, 91.
Redemption, process of	210, 266
Reflections on the scriptural representation of the nature and distinction of man	97
Regeneration, discourse on	124, 124, 277.
Religion a resource against despondency	122

INDEX.

	Page.
Religious Meditations	360, 405
Remarks on the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea	153
Revelation, necessity of	22
Review of Abercrombie's Lectures	13, 308.
——— Bishop White's Charge	219
——— Antidote to the Miseries of Human Life	228
Spiritural illustrations	32
Scriptures the source of hope	246
Sign of the Cross in Baptism	74
Syrian Churches	21
Theodorus	274
The Sinner	50
Thoughts on various subjects, by Bishop Horne	300, 372, 448
Thoughts on singing Psalms and Anthems	175
Whitsunday Address	162

POETRY.

	Page.
A dying Christian's address to the Sexton	158
A Father's prayer	306
Extract from Quarles's Emblems on the New-Year	34
Lines addressed by a Father to his Infant, &c.	157
The Aspiration	397
The departing Christian	307
The Friend	396
The Monkish Latin Hymn	398
Paraphrase of ditto	398
The wintry day	157

ERRATA.

Page 332, line 11 from the bottom, for 'continual,' read continued.
—— 333, the 2d and 3d line from the top to read thus: 'The twelfth and thirteenth chapters are a beautiful delineation of Christian morals. The fourteenth is admonition, not without a degree of,' &c.
—— 336, line 21, for 'Apostles,' read Apostle.
—— 336, line 30, for 'circumstances,' read circumstance.
—— 343, line 8, for 'bought,' read taught.